



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3370370

44 Minterne Road, Christchurch, Dorset BH23 3LE

- 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 Michal Lydka against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/00365/HOU.
 - The development proposed is bungalow re-modelling. Demolish garage, erect side & rear extensions, enlarge roof to form first floor accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development provided on the application form has superfluous and awkward phrasing. I have therefore adopted the wording from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.46 Minterne Road, having particular regard to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site lies within a cul-de-sac of Minterne Road, which typically comprises a mix of detached bungalows and chalet-style dwellings. While the wider area exhibits architectural variation, the immediate context retains a modest, low-rise character defined by hipped or gable roofs, and a rhythm of single storey or chalet bungalow forms.

5. The proposed side extension features a flat roof with a shallow hipped element and an artificial ridge line intended to echo the approved¹ chalet-style roof. However, this hybrid form appears visually contrived and sits awkwardly alongside the pitched roofs typical of the area, drawing attention to its incongruity. Although the extension is set back and avoids a full second storey, the roof design disrupts the building's proportions and undermines its chalet-style character, contributing to a perception of increased bulk and visual dominance.
6. The approved scheme² introduces an acceptable first-floor accommodation within a chalet-style envelope on the host building and incorporating a flat-roofed single storey extension. In contrast, the appeal proposal replaces the flat roof side extension with a flat roof with a shallow hipped element. Whilst this may appear more traditional in isolation, the resulting roof form extends laterally in a manner that competes with the original ridge line and disrupts the visual hierarchy of the chalet bungalow. The change introduces a more assertive and complex roofscape that detracts from the simplicity and coherence of the approved design.
7. The appellant refers to the allowed appeal at No.52 Minterne Road³ and suggests that the character of the street has evolved to accommodate larger and more varied forms of development. However, I understand that the decision concerned a pitched-roof extension and loft conversion, typologies that retained a degree of architectural coherence with the original dwelling and the prevailing roofscape. The Inspector's conclusion that the proposal was not out of keeping with the street scene was explicitly tied to the design's compatibility with neighbouring properties and the cumulative pattern of roof alterations, not to the principle of two-storey flank additions.
8. Whilst the Inspector at No.52 acknowledged a shift in character, the appeal proposal here introduces a flat-roofed two-storey flank wall, a markedly different typology in both form and visual impact. Unlike the pitched additions at No.52, the appeal scheme presents a more abrupt verticality and massing that interrupts the spatial rhythm of the cul-de-sac. The architectural grain of Minterne Road, though varied, remains sensitive to scale transitions and roof articulation. The proposed flank extension, by virtue of its height, bulk and flat-roofed design, would not read as a subordinate addition and would erode the residual coherence of the street scene.
9. The appellant has referred to examples of contemporary development in Victoria Road, Pauntley Road, and Foxwood Avenue, including flat-roofed side extensions. However, these examples lie outside the cul-de-sac and do not share the same spatial context or architectural rhythm as Minterne Road. The appeal site sits within a more enclosed and visually coherent street scene, characterised by modest, hipped-roof bungalows with relatively uniform massing and separation. In this context, the proposed two-storey flat-roofed side extension would appear as a discordant and visually prominent addition.
10. Whilst some of the examples identified exhibit tight relationships to neighbouring dwellings, they are located on through roads with more varied building lines, roof forms, and plot arrangements. The architectural diversity in those locations is more readily absorbed within the wider streetscape. By contrast, the cul-de-sac setting of

¹ LPA Reference: 8/24/0318/HOU

² LPA Reference: 8/24/0318/HOU

³ Appeal Reference APP/E1210/D/15/3003829

Minterne Road is more sensitive to changes in scale and typology, and the introduction of a flat-roofed two-storey element would disrupt the established character. Accordingly, the cited examples do not provide a compelling precedent for development of this nature within the appeal site's setting.

11. While the wider area may accommodate architectural diversity, the immediate context of the appeal site remains sensitive to scale, massing, and roof form. The proposed extension would disrupt the established character and fail to appear as a subordinate addition. It would therefore conflict with Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (2014) and saved Policy H12 of the Christchurch Local Plan (2001). These policies aim to ensure that development is of high-quality design, compatible with or enhancing its surroundings, and appropriate in character, scale, design, and materials within the immediate locality.

Living Conditions

12. No. 46 Minterne Road lies immediately to the northwest of the appeal site and contains three windows on its southeast elevation, which I understand serve a lounge, dining room and office/bedroom. The windows to the dining room and office/bedroom are the sole source of light and outlook to those spaces.
13. The presence of sole habitable windows materially elevates the sensitivity of the relationship. The proposed extension would obstruct the upper third of these windows, resulting in a perceptible loss of daylight and outlook that cannot be mitigated by boundary treatments or internal layout.
14. The proposed extension would be located in close proximity to these windows. While I acknowledge that the roof slopes away from the neighbouring property, this does not sufficiently mitigate the impact on daylight or outlook. Given its siting, height, and orientation, the extension would still result in a significant reduction in daylight, particularly during morning hours. Furthermore, although the appellant highlights that the proposal does not extend rearwards beyond the existing dwelling and that the roof pitch and eaves would match the existing dwelling, these factors do not overcome the concern that the extension would appear unduly overbearing when viewed from within those rooms, thereby diminishing the quality of the internal environment.
15. During my site visit, I observed the relationship between the neighbouring windows and the close-boarded boundary fence. While it is acknowledged that only the upper third of the windows would be affected due to the height of the fence, the proposed development would obstruct light to this portion, resulting in a harmless loss of daylight. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that this would not be the case.
16. The appellant contends that similar relationships exist elsewhere in the locality. However, the examples provided do not replicate the specific circumstances here, namely, the presence of sole habitable windows in close proximity to a two-storey flank wall. In those other cases, affected rooms are either dual aspect, served by alternative windows, bathroom windows, or the extensions are of lesser height and depth. Furthermore, the full circumstances of those other schemes are not before me. Accordingly, they are materially different to the appeal scheme before me, and I therefore give them limited weight in my decision.

17. A fallback under permitted development rights has also been suggested by the appellant, involving a single-storey flat-roofed extension with a parapet wall up to 3.6 metres in height to the boundary with no.46. While this may broadly replicate some aspects of the massing, such an alternative is not before me and would differ materially in form, scale and visual impact from the two-storey extension proposed. It does not alter my assessment of the planning merits of the appeal scheme.
18. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy HE2 of the East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (2014) and saved Policy H12 of the Christchurch Local Plan (2001), which seek to ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings and does not adversely affect neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR