



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2025

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3365625

42 Bournemouth Road, Bournemouth, Poole BH14 0EY

- 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 Hennings against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is APP/24/01063/F.
 - The development proposed is loft extension and conversion including; raising roof eaves and ridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. The adjoining property at 42a Bournemouth Road (No. 42a) was originally part of the appeal property but has since been converted into a separate dwelling. While there are some differences between the two, such as separate entrances and variations in their front façades, they share a common roof form.
4. The proposal seeks to create a new master bedroom at second-floor level. To facilitate this, the scheme includes increasing the height of the appeal property. As part of the proposal, the appellant also intends to remove the dark horizontal cladding and replace it with white render on the first floor and the extended elevations forming the new bedroom at roof level.
5. Bournemouth Road (A35) is a main arterial route between Bournemouth and Poole. Along the A35, including near the appeal site, buildings vary in style and scale. Generally, these buildings are well-designed, and differences in height and scale are absorbed by plot sizes and spacing between structures.
6. The appeal property is part of a row of buildings (including Nos. 42a, 44, 46, and 48) located off the A35 and arranged at an angle to the road. Despite being set back within its plot and partially screened by a row of protected trees along the frontage, the appeal property and nearby buildings remain visible when travelling west along the A35, including from its junction with Courtenay Road.

7. Regardless of the degree of screening at the appeal site, the requirement for good design and compatibility with the surrounding context remains essential.
8. The nearby buildings Nos. 44 and 46, are also two-storey dwellings but detached. No. 48 is a three-storey apartment block, though its stepped roofline helps transition the change in height and scale between it and adjacent properties. There is a degree of consistency in roof heights, and the appeal property features a front gable similar to No. 44. Additionally, there is alignment in the front window placement among the appeal property, No. 42a, and No. 44.
9. Based on my observations, the appeal property is primarily viewed in the context of these neighbouring buildings. Due to its design and scale, it sits comfortably among them and contributes positively to the wider street scene.
10. Although the proposed extension would retain the existing roof profile and pitch, and despite the appellant's claim that it does not constitute a full additional storey, it would noticeably increase the height and massing of the appeal property.
11. The inclusion of an additional tier of glazing on the front and rear elevations would give the extended property the appearance of a three-storey building.
12. Most notably, the front elevation would feature a disproportionate increase in wall height and separation between the existing first-floor windows and those proposed in the extension, compared to the spacing between the ground and first-floor windows. This would give the appeal property an uncharacteristically tall appearance. Consequently, due to its design and height relative to No. 42a and nearby dwellings (Nos. 44 and 46), the appeal property would appear incongruous.
13. The appellant has cited examples of other developments in the area, mainly apartment blocks and a detached dwelling. However, these do not share the same form as the semi-detached appeal property. Furthermore, I have assessed the proposal based on its specific site context, and these examples are not directly comparable or sufficient to alter my findings on this main issue.
14. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with the design objectives of Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018). ('LP'). This policy requires a high standard of design in all new developments, including extensions and external alterations. It also stipulates that development should reflect or enhance local patterns and neighbouring buildings in terms of height, scale, detailing, and visual impact. Extensions and alterations should respect and relate to the existing building and maintain or enhance features that contribute positively to local character.

Living Conditions of Neighbours

15. The proposed extension would result in a noticeable increase in the overall scale of the appeal property, though this would be confined to its existing two-storey element.
16. Regarding No. 42a, the extension would be primarily visible from its outdoor amenity space located to the rear and side. This space is not extensive, and views towards the appeal property are partially obstructed by the built form of No. 42a. As such, it would be difficult to view the full extent of the extension from any single point within the amenity space.

17. The two-storey part of the appeal property already projects approximately 2.9 metres beyond the rear building line of No. 44, and its first-floor element is visible from No. 44's outdoor amenity space adjacent to its ground-floor living area. In this context, although the second-floor extension would be visible, its limited depth and separation from the shared boundary mean it would not appear unduly dominant.
18. From other parts of No. 44's amenity space, the extension would be more visible. However, in these more distant views, and considering the existing built form, the extension would not be overly dominant.
19. No. 44 has two windows in its side elevation facing the appeal site. Based on the evidence, these do not serve habitable rooms. Although the side gable of the appeal property would be increased in height, it is unlikely to significantly affect the outlook from these windows.
20. The appeal property has a rear-facing bedroom window on its south elevation, positioned away from the boundary with No. 42a. Due to the nature of the shared rear boundary, which extends further toward No. 42a, this arrangement currently allows only limited views over the rear amenity space for No. 42a.
21. The proposed extension would include extensive glazing across its rear elevation. Combined with its elevated position, this would increase overlooking of the rear amenity space for No. 42a. However, such overlooking would be oblique and limited to part of the amenity space. Given the built-up residential context, where some mutual overlooking is expected, this would not be unduly intrusive.
22. For the above reasons, the proposed extension would not be excessively dominant, overbearing, or result in significant loss of privacy for neighbouring residents.
23. Accordingly, I find no conflict with LP Policy PP27, which requires that proposals be compatible with surrounding uses and not harm residential amenity in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy, noise, emissions, artificial light, or oppressive design.

Other Considerations

24. The proposal would allow the appellant and his family to remain in their home rather than relocate. The appellant notes that Planning Inspectors reviewing the draft Local Plan have found the Council failed to meet the Duty to Cooperate, potentially leading to its rejection or withdrawal. He argues this increases the importance of enabling families to adapt and improve existing homes. However, as the draft Local Plan remains under consideration, its outcomes are uncertain. Regardless, it is a well-established principle that the planning system does not exist to protect private interests, which can include such personal circumstances.

Conclusion

25. While I find that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours, it would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. For this reason, and due to conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Aqbal
INSPECTOR