

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/16/3158672

38 Newmorton Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3NX

- 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 Borthwick against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-26283, dated 26 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft conversion and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was made in the name of Mr & Mrs Northwick. The appeal was made in the name of Mr Borthwick. However, the plans which accompanied the application give the name of the agent's client as Mr & Mrs Borthwick. I am satisfied therefore that the spelling of the surname given on the planning application form is merely a typographical error and that the appeal has been properly made by one of the original applicants.
3. The application was amended through the submission of revised Drg Nos J252-003 Rev A and J252-004 Rev A, upon which my decision is based.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Newmorton Road is part of a wider residential area comprising mostly detached bungalows of broadly similar age and appearance. No 38 is at the eastern end of a group of 13 properties that run in an arc along the north side of Newmorton Road and which merge into Strathmore Road to the west. The regular design and layout of these properties, with their hipped roofs, a ridge line set perpendicular to the road, and a subservient gable projection to one
-

side of each dwellings' front elevation imparts an important sense of uniformity and rhythm to this part of the street scene despite some minor differences to their appearances.

6. The proposal is to enlarge the property by projecting the existing profile of the building rearwards and to provide accommodation at first floor level including roof additions to both sides. A small dormer window is also proposed to the front elevation.
7. The Council's *Residential Extensions - A Design Guide for Householders* (the Design Guide) was adopted in 2008. It is intended to be used as best practice guidance, in line with the Council's commitment to improving the quality of design in its built environment, to advise householders, architects and builders, who are planning to extend or alter individual properties. Amongst its basic design principles the Design Guide advises that proposals should maintain or enhance the character of the existing house and its setting and that extensions and alterations should not dominate the existing building. Section 3.3 of the Design Guide deals specifically with roof alterations and with respect to dormer windows it includes the following points to note: (i) the size of the dormer should be determined by the pattern of windows on the elevation of the house; (ii) dormers with a horizontal emphasis and flat roofs should be avoided; and (iii) any dormer should be set well below the ridge line and up from the eaves of the existing roof.
8. The proposed dormer to the east side elevation of the dwelling would be devoid of any windows or any other detailing or articulation of any merit. Although it would sit below the ridge and up from the eaves it would appear as an incongruous, box-like projection with a clear horizontal emphasis that would be wholly unrelated to the form or appearance of the dwelling as a whole.
9. The roof addition to the opposite side would be unusual, appearing as a side gable projection with dormer wings to each side. It would reflect nothing of the character of the original dwelling and its dormer sections would again be devoid of any meaningful detail. Despite the gabled element I find that it too would be overtly horizontal in its proportions and due to its overall size, including its height close to the dwelling's main ridge, it would be seen as a dominant part of this side roof slope.
10. In both cases the side roof additions would fail to reflect the Council's design guidance and, due to the orientation of the building and the spacing with its adjoining neighbours, each would be open to clear views within the street scene, where their awkward presence would be evident. The dormer to the front elevation would follow the profile of the existing building and would appear comfortable in its setting. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, my overall findings are that the roof additions to each side would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling and pattern of the street scene and would be detrimental to the wider character and appearance of the area. In this regard the proposal would fail to display the design quality that is required by Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and by a core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. The appellant has photographed a number of dormer extensions in the locality. A significant number of these show modest front dormers similar to the appeal

proposal to which I find no fault. I have noted some other examples of side dormer extensions, none of which follow the advice within the Design Guide. However, the specific example given at 7 Granby Road clearly predates the adoption of the Design Guide with the planning application dating back to 2004 according to the appellant. I have no evidence to suggest that the case at 27 Granby Road was given planning permission post adoption of the Design Guide. In any case, I saw during my visit that such side additions were few and far between amongst a fairly large area of mostly similar styled properties where the significant majority retained their original roof profile. Rather than setting any precedent, the examples I have seen demonstrate to me the harm that can be caused by poor design to the visual cohesion and harmony of an area.

12. I recognise the efforts made by the appellant to try to address the Council's original concerns and his desire to provide additional living space for his family but these factors do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Accordingly, and despite the absence of objections from any interested parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR