

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/16/3159354

1 Knowlton Gardens, Bournemouth, BH9 3RB

- 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 Trevor Kelly against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-26340, dated 9 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached annexe for ancillary use to house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. No 1 is an end of terrace, two-storey dwelling occupying a corner plot within a fairly modern housing estate. The appeal site has a side return boundary to Colehill Crescent along the outside of a fairly acute bend. The proposal is to convert an existing, single-storey, flat roofed garden room building that sits at the foot of the rear garden to No 1 into an annexe for accommodation to be used ancillary to the main dwelling. The works would include extending the length and width of the existing building, adding a pitched roof over the majority part of its floorspace and providing accommodation at first floor level.
 4. 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. Its section 3.8 specifically discusses annexes and advises that if such a facility is to be a separate structure this must remain subservient to the existing property and be
-

of a suitable scale for its purpose. It further advises that over large buildings will not be considered acceptable.

5. The existing garden room has an inconspicuous presence beyond the confines of the appeal site being set away from the boundary with Colehill Crescent and behind an approximate 2m high solid boundary fence and gated enclosure that adjoins the back edge of the adjacent footpath. It is a typically modest garden outbuilding with limited impact upon its wider surroundings.
6. In contrast, the proposed annexe would be clearly visible in its rear garden setting. Its steeply pitched roof would appear noticeably taller than most subservient garden structures that would be typical for this residential estate. Furthermore, the choice of coloured cement fibre boarding for its walls and the use of expansive vertically glazed elements to its elevation facing Colehill Crescent would make the building stand uncharacteristically apart from the traditional architecture of its surroundings. Overall I find that, by reason of its siting, scale and appearance, the building would be incongruous within the street scene and overly dominant within the fairly tight constraints of its residential garden setting. In this regard it would conflict with the Council's guidelines for annexes and 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.
7. The Council's guidance states that if permission is granted for an annexe conditions will be imposed to ensure that the structure is not used as an independent home. I am therefore puzzled by the concern expressed within the Council's officer's report over the future potential for the building to be used as an independent dwelling as it is clear the Council accepts that this could be adequately controlled by condition. Notwithstanding, I find overall that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, including some positive comments from neighbours, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR