



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2022.

**by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 06 May 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3361118**

**63 Richmond Park Road, Bournemouth BH8 8TX**

- 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 Mrs Sylvie Honying against the decision of BCP Council.
  - The application Ref is 7-2024-8739-E.
  - The development proposed is side/rear extension to infill gap between outbuilding and house.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The applications forms indicated that the development had commenced but had not been completed at the time the application was submitted. I am therefore required to assess as a proposed development, based on the submitted plans.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the street scene.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached residential property which faces onto Richmond Park Road (A3049) with a long side return to Stour Road, which is a no-through road for vehicular traffic off or onto Richmond Park Road and within a predominantly residential area. The existing house is red brick with a tile roof with an existing detached outbuilding and garage at the rear. There is a fence along much of the length of the side return with hedge planting extending above the fence line.
5. The proposal would infill the open gap between the rear of the main house and the outbuilding with a lean-to style 'conservatory' extension, clad in UPVC materials.
6. Taken on its own, the scale and massing of the proposed extension would be a very modest addition to the overall form and proportions of the main house. However, it would infill the remaining open gap between the existing house and the outbuilding and garage, with an awkward junction at roof level with the existing outbuilding.

7. The red brick of the main house contrasts with the render finish to the adjoining outbuilding. The introduction of UPVC for the walls, roof and fenestration of the proposed extension would be a discordant addition which would neither relate to the main house or the outbuilding, and would detract from the character and appearance of the existing building.
8. Much of the proposed extension would be screened from views outside of the site given the boundary fencing and vegetation. However, it is not clear to me whether the planting would offer a screen during the winter months and furthermore it would not be possible to rely in perpetuity on soft planting to provide a permanent screen. In such views, the poor quality of the materials and contrast with the design and appearance of the existing property would be incongruous and detract from the street scene.
9. Taking all these factors together, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not respect the character and appearance of the existing property or the street scene. This would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), the Council's adopted Residential Extensions: A Design Guide (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.

### **Other Considerations**

10. The Appellant has contended that a similar structure could have been constructed as permitted development, but I am required to consider the proposal on the basis of the submitted plans. I have taken into account that the extension would meet the day to days needs of the Appellant but that does not outweigh the harm I have concluded from the proposal before me.

### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to override this finding. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*L J Evans*

INSPECTOR