



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3369106

Proposal: Rear and side extension and new roof incorporating loft conversion at 28 Ricardo Crescent, Christchurch BH23 4BX.

Application Ref: P/25/00033/HOU.

Decision - Dismissed

Reasons

Issue - effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area

1. The appeal property (No. 28) is a detached bungalow. It is located within Ricardo Crescent, which is characterised by low profile single storey dwellings which, despite some minor variations, are generally similar in design and of the same height. At present, No. 28 reflects the consistent building height of the surrounding single storey properties and thus contributes positively to the uniform character and appearance of the area.
2. The appeal proposal seeks to increase the ridge height of the dwelling upwards considerably beyond the existing building height. It would also increase the height and width of the projecting front gable and introduce dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes. The eaves height would remain unchanged, and the main roof slope would be set back from the front elevation of the adjoining property at 26 Ricardo Crescent. Nonetheless, by virtue of the height, bulk and scale of the proposed development the resulting dwelling would appear unduly dominating and visually incongruous in the local context. Consequently, it would detract from the prevailing character of the area. The remaining space between the built form and the adjoining properties, which would be modest, would not mitigate these effects.
3. In light of the above considerations, I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would conflict with the development plan policies cited in the decision notice.

Other Matters

4. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments do not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change. However, it also seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment. In addition, while I am mindful of advice in the National Design Guide, January 2021, that well-designed places do not need to copy their surroundings in

every way, and it is appropriate to introduce elements that reflect how we live today, it is also clear that well-designed development is that which integrates into its surroundings so it relates well to them.

5. While the Council has found an upward extension to be acceptable at 47 Ricardo Crescent, this is not a feature of the character of Ricardo Crescent generally. As indicated above, this particular proposal, assessed on its own merits, would lead to harm to that character.
6. My attention is also drawn to examples of developments at Mortimer Close, Bure Haven Drive, Falcon Drive and Wren Close. However, these properties appear to be in a different context to the appeal site, whereby the surrounding built form is more varied in terms of building heights and roof designs. Therefore, from the evidence before me, they do not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme, and as such the weight to be attached to these is limited.
7. Extending upwards may represent an efficient use of the site, while maintaining the existing landscaping and outdoor space. However, there is no compelling evidence that harm would arise should an alternative scheme to enlarge the dwelling be pursued, or that the appeal proposal is the only means to increase the floor area of the property to provide family sized accommodation.
8. Even if the proposed development would not give rise to harm in other regards, this is a normal expectation of new development and therefore of neutral weight.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Thus, the appeal is dismissed.

E Worley

INSPECTOR