
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2025

by **Lewis Condé BSc, MSc, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3357558 120 Parkwood Road, Bournemouth BH5 2BN

- 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 Andrew Vella against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2024-14198-B.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey rear extension, erection of a two-storey side extension, hip to gable roof alteration and associated internal remodelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the Council's decision notice, as opposed to the original application form, as this provides a more accurate description of development.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. In respect of matters of pertinence to this appeal there have been no fundamental changes.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of neighbouring residents at no. 122 Parkwood Road, with respect to loss of outlook and light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. No. 120 Parkwood Road is a detached, two-storey dwelling. Parkwood Road is a residential street that is characterised by a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings. For the most part, dwellings share some continuity through their consistent building lines and mainly displaying hipped roofs and front gables. However, there is some notable divergence in the appearance of some properties along the street. This includes through use of differing materials, while several dwellings having also been extended or altered in a variety of manners, some of which have been rather unsympathetic additions.

6. Despite wider elements of the proposal not having a materially harmful effect, I find that the proposed flat roof, two-storey, extension is of a poor form of design that would not relate well to the host dwelling. Indeed, the proposed flat roof and the manner that it would sit alongside the main roof of the appeal building would result in an incongruous addition. The ill-fitting design would not be overcome through the proposal's use of suitable materials.
7. Regardless of the divergence in appearance of properties nearby, the proposal does not respect the character or appearance of the host property. Whilst public views of the extension may be limited, neighbouring residents are likely to be able to see it from their properties. In any case, a lack of prominence is not a suitable reason to accept poor design quality.
8. The appellant has referred to other alterations to properties in the local area, including nearby along Parkwood Road, which are suggested as being more harmful than the current proposal. Notwithstanding that I do not have details of whether those other works required or secured planning permission, I do not consider that these justify further development that would be of a poor design standard. Additionally, no technical reasons have been presented to justify the use of a flat roof on the two-storey extension rather than a more sympathetic design solution.
9. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property with consequent harm to the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (adopted 2012) (the Core Strategy), as well as Policy BAP1 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (made 2019) (the Neighbourhood Plan). Together, amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development is well designed and of a high-quality including through respecting the site and its surroundings.
10. The proposal would also fail to adhere to the aims of Section 12 of the Framework 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' and the advice of the Council's Design Guide in respect of the design of extensions.

Living Conditions of Neighbouring Residents

11. There is a rather tight urban grain along Parkwood Road, with residential dwellings sharing close relationships. Indeed, the appeal property and adjacent no. 122 are positioned closely alongside one another, with both properties having narrow side accesses alongside the shared boundary. The distance between the side elevations of the dwellings increases slightly towards the rear as both properties contain a mirroring instep away from the boundary line.
12. The proposed two-storey extension would infill the existing instep to no.120, marginally reducing the gap between the corresponding side elevation at no. 122. Still, both properties would remain set slightly off the shared boundary line.
13. Even if the relevant ground floor windows to no. 122 do serve habitable rooms, I do not consider that the proposal would lead to any meaningful loss of outlook or light to the neighbouring residents. This is due to the existing close relationship between the properties, the likely degree of outlook and light that these rooms already enjoy, and because the proposal would bring additional built form only marginally closer to the neighbouring dwellinghouse.

14. Consequently, in respect of this main issue, I find there to be no conflict with Core Strategy Policy CS41, which amongst other matters, seeks to prevent development that would be detrimental to amenity by virtue of its design.
15. The Council's decision notice also referred to Policy BAP1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, but I have not found it to be directly relevant to this main issue.

Other Matters

16. A lack of objections from neighbouring residents is not a suitable justification to allow the appeal proposal.
17. The appellant has raised grievances with the way the local planning authority dealt with the original application, but this does not affect my decision which has been made on the merits of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, that indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Lewis Condé

INSPECTOR