



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2025

by **J Evans BA(Hons) AssocRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3371657

29 Dunyeats Road, BROADSTONE BH18 8AB

- 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 Mark Aldridge against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/00692/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as a replacement garage with first floor accommodation over and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement garage with first floor accommodation over and single storey rear extension, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: P/25/00692/HOU, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block & Location Plan (Drawing No. 100); Proposed Site Plan (Drawing No. 101); Proposed Floor Plans (Drawing No. 105); Proposed Roof Plan (Drawing No. 106); Proposed Elevations 1 (Drawing No. 107); and Proposed Elevations 2 (Drawing No. 108).
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as shown on the approved plans.
 - 4) The flat roof area to the kitchen, dining and snug area as shown on Proposed Floor Plans (Drawing No. 105); Proposed Roof Plan (Drawing No. 106); Proposed Elevations 1 (Drawing No. 107); and Proposed Elevations 2 (Drawing No. 108) shall not be used as a balcony, terrace, roof garden or similar amenity area without the grant of a further permission from the local planning authority.
 - 5) The development hereby approved shall not be brought into use until full details of the enhancement measures as set out in Section 5 of the Preliminary Roost Appraisal dated 13 November 2024 undertaken by Cherry Tree Ecology Ltd have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and thereafter installed. These measures shall be permanently retained in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effects of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the setting of heritage assets, namely the adjacent Tudor and Golf Links Road Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. No. 29 is a detached two storey dwelling with a single storey garage to its side. The property has distinct mid C20 characteristics and is set back from the highway behind an evergreen boundary hedge and a spacious front garden with natural landscaping.
4. To the west of No.29 is the Community and Arts Centre and associated grounds, which includes a number of mature trees towards the boundary with No.29. This boundary forms the CA boundary. The Tudor/ Golf Links Road Conservation Area Map 2 provided to me by the Council, refers to No.29 and other properties to the east as falling within the setting of the CA, from all that I have observed, and due to the proximity to the CA boundary, I agree.
5. The proposal seeks to replace the existing modest garage with a one and a half storey linked side extension that would provide for a double garage at ground floor level and an en-suite bedroom at the first floor. The proposal also seeks to construct a rear single storey flat roofed extension to provide for an enlarged kitchen/ dining area with a snug.
6. The design approach for the side extension is for a part hipped gable feature to present towards the front street facing elevation. The overall form and massing being set below that of No. 29 by accommodating the first floor in part within the angled roof form of the proposal.
7. To my mind, the form and massing of the side extension would appear subservient and consistent to the two-storey scale and angular roof form of the main dwelling. The subservience would also be reinforced as a consequence of the set back siting of the extension to the forward line of No.29. The window detailing to the upper floor would also appear broadly consistent with what exists already, and whilst I acknowledge that some of the materials, finishes and design details proposed would represent variations to what is found on No.29, they are nonetheless design components which are representative of typical domestic features and would not appear odd or out of place in the site context.
8. Turning to the rear extension, the alterations proposed here would be relatively modest and would not be readily visible from outside of the appeal site. I also acknowledge that the reason for refusal was specific to the effects of the side extension only. I therefore have no objections to the proposed rear extension.
9. With regard to the effects upon the setting of the CA, I have had regard to the Broadstone Conservation Areas Character Appraisal and Management Plan: Ridgeway/Broadstone Park and Tudor/Golf Links Road Areas 2009, which amongst other matters identifies the Community and Arts Centre to the west as a locally listed building.
10. From my site visit it was evident to me that the proposal would have no resultant harm upon the significance of the CA, and its character and appearance would be preserved. This is due to the reasons I have already set out above, alongside the

separation distances from key buildings and features within the CA including the Community and Arts Centre, and intervening boundary enclosures and trees.

11. It follows therefore, that I find that the appeal proposal is in accordance with Policy PP27 of the Poole Local Plan (November 2018) and Policies BP 4 and BP 8 of the Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan (July 2018) and Sections 12 and 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). These require, among other things, that development is of a high quality of design; with extensions complementing the architecture and use of materials of the existing building and reflecting the prevailing pattern of development, scale and rhythm when viewed from the street; and for development proposals to preserve and enhance, or better reveal the significance of the CA.

Other Matters

12. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal against the plans upon which the Council based its decision. I acknowledge through the appellant's Appeal Statement a set of revised plans have been provided at Appendix A seeking to address the concerns expressed by the Council on the proposed use of materials. However, I am conscious that the Planning Appeals Procedural Guide makes clear that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. In any case, as I am allowing the appeal proposal based upon the determined plans, it has not been necessary for me to consider whether or not I could have accepted these revised plans as part of my determination.

Conditions

13. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
14. The standard time limit is required together with a condition listing the plans in the interests of certainty. I have also included a condition requiring that the materials to be used are as shown on the approved plans. I am satisfied that a condition is necessary to ensure that the flat roofed area of the rear extension is not used as a balcony thereby preventing overlooking of the neighbouring property. I also agree that a condition is necessary to secure that ecological enhancements are undertaken in accordance with the recommendations of the appellant's Preliminary Roost Appraisal.
15. A condition is also suggested by the Council outlining measures to be applied in circumstances whereby unexpected land contamination could potentially be discovered as part of the development proposals. However, from review of the consultee comments from the Council's Environmental Health Contact Officer they have stated that a standard contaminated land condition is not necessary. I agree, I have therefore not imposed this suggested condition.

Conclusions

16. For all of the above reasons, having regard to all matters raised, and subject to the specified conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Evans

INSPECTOR