



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C.** Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3357265

18 Sterte Road, Poole BH15 2AG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Alan Marston against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application ref. is APP/24/00650/F.
 - The development proposed is a second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In conjunction with this householder appeal the appellant has submitted a Daylight and Sunlight report to address the Council's second reason for refusal which alleges undue loss of light to no.16 Sterte Road and its garden. This was not submitted with the planning application. I am not able to treat this report as evidence before me as neither the Council nor interested parties have apparently read and/or commented on this document. Both would be substantially prejudiced if I took the contents into account.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in the appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, and the effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 16 Sterte Road in relation to outlook and light, and the occupants of 18 Sterte Road (the appeal site) in relation to sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the eastern side of Sterte Road. The front of the site is enclosed with a low brick wall and railings, with a gate and pedestrian access to the rear. The site is elevated from the footway. There is a very small rear garden. The semi-pair to the appeal site is no.20 Sterte Road to the north. No.16 Sterte Road is to the south and is also semi-detached. It has a rear conservatory adjacent to its boundary with no.14 Sterte Road. There is a small gap between no.16 and the appeal site dwelling. The street is a mix of semi-detached and terraced houses.

5. The proposal is to erect a rear extension at first floor level above part of the flat-roofed rear single storey extension used as a garden room at the appeal site. It would have a flat roof. It would be flush with the southern flank wall of the single storey rear extension and so set-in from no.20. It would be higher than the eaves of the main dwelling. It would be used as a bedroom and would be connected at first floor level to the main house. It would also have an internal staircase connecting the bedroom to the garden room below.
6. The proposed second storey would project about 3.6m from the main rear elevation of the existing dwelling and would span a width of about 3.6m with an overall height of about 5.7m. The increased bulk and massing in this location would be an awkward and incongruous extension which would be noticeably unsympathetic to the character of the host dwelling. The design is poor, and the overall height fails to provide a subservient harmonious addition to the main dwelling.
7. I have noted that there are examples of two storey rear additions in the immediate area. However, their designs are predominantly more sympathetic to their host dwellings than the appeal scheme. I do not agree with the appellant that the form of development here, sited as is proposed, reflects the pattern of development in the area. It does not. As a result, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area from the development proposed, in addition to harm to the host dwelling.
8. On this issue, I conclude that the proposal would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to policy PP27(1)(a) of the Poole Local Plan (adopted November 2018) 'LP'.

Living conditions for occupants of 16 Sterte Road and 18 Sterte Road

9. In relation to 16 Sterte Road to the south, the proposal would result in a greater bulk and mass of neighbouring development at first floor level closer to the rear garden. The proposed extension would be positioned about 1m from the boundary with no.16 and would protrude about 3.6m from the main rear elevation of the appeal dwelling. Its flank wall would be openly seen at close quarters from the immediately adjoining rear garden, extending significantly above the height of the garden fence. It would loom above the garden and in my view, this would bring an unacceptable sense of enclosure for the occupants of no.16 when using their garden. Owing to the proposed extension being broadly to the north/north east of no.16's garden, I am not persuaded that any additional shading of the garden caused by the proposal would be sufficient to sustain a planning objection on that basis. Furthermore, given the separation distances from the rear windows of no.16, I am not persuaded that light reaching those rooms would be unduly cut down by the presence of the proposed extension.
10. In respect of living conditions for the occupants and future occupants of the appeal site dwelling, the small rear garden affords some space to sit out. The proposed extension would block some direct sunlight from that area during the afternoons and early evenings and I consider this would be an unacceptably harmful effect diminishing enjoyment of the garden for occupants and future occupants of the appeal site.
11. On this issue, notwithstanding that I have not found harm to amenity by reason of loss of light for the occupants of no.16 Sterte Road, I conclude that there would be an unacceptable sense of enclosure and loss of outlook for them when in their rear garden. I also conclude that there would be an unacceptable loss of sunlight for the occupants of the appeal site when in their rear garden. As a result the proposal would be contrary to policy PP27(1) (c) and (d) of the LP.
12. In coming to my decision, I have borne in mind, amongst other things, that the extension would serve as additional accommodation for an ageing relative with special needs and whilst I have considerable sympathy with this need, it does not outweigh the harms I have identified above.

Conclusion

13. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector