

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2017

by Elizabeth Lawrence BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/16/3160502

59 Jewell Road, Bournemouth, BH8 0JL.

- 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 Younes Caurti against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-25726-B dated 26 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as application for permission to build two storey side extension to the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Jewell Road is characterised by uniformly designed and sited semi-detached houses interspersed with short terraces. The dwellings are set behind good sized front gardens and there are wide gaps between the dwellings, which together with the open green opposite the Appeal site contribute to the spacious character and appearance of the area.
 4. Together and amongst other things policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan – Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), seek to ensure that new development is well designed and of a high quality. It should respect the site and its surroundings and contribute positively to the appearance of the public realm.
 5. The current gap between the Appeal dwelling and the dwelling at No.57 is particularly generous, compared to the gaps between the pairs of houses to the east. Planning permission has been granted for a two storey side extension to No.57 which. On the basis of the information submitted if this permission was implemented it would reduce the gap between No.57 and the Appeal dwelling to between approximately four and six metres. This would still be generous,
-

although it would be narrower than some of the gaps between dwellings found further to the west along the north side of Jewell Road.

6. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary it has to be assumed that the existing planning permission to extend the dwelling at No.57 will be implemented. That extension together with the Appeal proposal would reduce the gap between the two properties to between approximately 1.8 and 3.6 metres. This would be uncharacteristically narrow and as a result the relationship between the two dwellings would be visually cramped. The situation would not be helped by the prominent position of the Appeal site on the inside of a slight bend in the road and opposite the open green. In addition, the fact that the proposed extension would project forward of the extension at No.57 would increase its prominence and cramped relationship with No.57 within the street scene.
7. As advised in the Council's Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders 2008 (DG) often the character of an area is a result of the spaces between buildings. Side extensions can result in a cramped appearance or terracing effect that can harm the character of the street. To address this, the DG advises that side extensions should be set a minimum of one metre from the adjacent side boundary. This is something that can be particularly important where two storey side extensions are proposed. Whilst this document is not formally adopted paragraph 4.6.16 of the CS states that it acts as best practice guidance and assists in interpreting national and local planning policies.
8. Overall the relationship between the two extended dwellings would be cramped and would materially harm the spatial characteristics of the street scene and the surrounding area. The harm that would result from the combined developments would outweigh the benefits for the Appellant and their family which would result from the scheme. This harm could not be satisfactorily addressed through the imposition of conditions.
9. I conclude that the proposal would materially detract from and undermine the spacious character and appearance of the street scene. Accordingly it would conflict with policy CS41 of the CS, the NPPF and the objectives of the DG.

Elizabeth Lawrence

INSPECTOR