

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/16/3159008
10 Winston Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Gates against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-26065-B, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to the extant dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to the extant dwellinghouse at 10 Winston Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2016-26065-B, dated 1 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: Drg No 15/399/03.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling house along a residential road comprising properties of broadly similar age but of mixed types and appearances. The dwellings all have fairly shallow frontages and a variety of gaps between side boundaries and neighbouring properties. When this is combined with the echelon pattern to the layout of the dwellings and the fairly
-

steep gradient of Winston Road, with neighbouring properties at noticeably different levels to each other, I find there to be no particular rhythm or uniformity to the street scene that is important to the residential character of the area.

4. Planning permission was granted earlier this year for what was described as '*alterations, extensions and installation of rooflights to dwellinghouse*' (Ref 7-2016-26065-A). The permitted scheme includes a two-storey extension to the side of No 10 projecting almost up to the side boundary with No 8, and a single-storey lean-to addition to the opposite side extending up to the side common boundary with No 12. At the time of my visit I saw that work had started on site.
5. The principal difference between the appeal proposal and the permitted scheme is the scale of the addition to one side, adjacent to No 12. It is now proposed to include accommodation over the permitted ground floor extension. This area would serve as a dressing room and en-suite bathroom for an existing first floor bedroom and as such no windows are proposed to the front elevation at this level. Instead the roof over would be dual pitched to the front and side with a fairly low eaves height to the front, and constructed simply as a downward projection of the existing roof slope which sits over the main body of the original house. Despite having accommodation on two floors the scale of the extension to this side would not appear obviously two-storey and would be seen as an appropriately subservient and well considered addition.
6. The Council is concerned that because the works as a whole would extend the property across the full width of the plot there would be an unacceptable terracing effect with neighbouring properties. However, Nos 8 and 12 are both set away from their respective side boundaries with No 10 by the width of a pedestrian walkway in each case. The separation distance between the extension proposed adjacent to No 12 would be more or less comparable to the separation distance that has already been permitted by the Council with regard to the appeal property's relationship with No 8. In addition, the spacing would reflect that of some other properties with their neighbours elsewhere along Winston Road. Added to this is the subservient form of the extension proposed adjacent to No 12 and its recessed position in relation to that property.
7. When all this is taken together I find that the proposal would have no harmful impact upon the character or appearance of the street scene. I recognise that the proposal does not comply with the guidance contained within the Council's *Residential Extensions - A Design Guide for Householders*, adopted in 2008. This advises that side extensions should be set at least 1.0m off the side boundary of the property. However, the Council's own interpretation of their guidance with respect to the permitted scheme shows clearly that a strict application in all cases is not always necessary or appropriate. In this instance the gap with No 12 would not be filled and, for the reasons given, I am satisfied that the proposal would not appear unreasonably cramped. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted in 2012, which deals with the quality of design. Neither do I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it relates to similar matters.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawing as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in materials to match the existing.
9. I have noted a comment from a nearby resident with regard to restricting the hours of building and site works although I have no evidence to suggest such a condition was imposed by the Council in relation to the extant planning permission. In any event I am satisfied that the works would be fairly short lived and that any unacceptable nuisance would reasonably be controlled by other appropriate legislation.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR