

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2017

by L Gibbons BA (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3167237
64 Alyth Road, Bournemouth BH3 7HD

- 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 & Mrs Watts against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-26261, dated 26 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front, side and rear extension, raise in ridge height, new porch roof and front extension to existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front, side and rear extension, raise in ridge height, new porch roof and front extension to existing garage at 64 Alyth Road, Bournemouth BH3 7HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2016-26261 dated 26 August 2016, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001 Rev A and 002 Rev B.
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition 2 no development shall take place until details of the proposed side (west) elevation have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. For the sake of clarity, I have used the description of development as set out in planning application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the existing dwelling.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area. The houses and chalet bungalows are large detached properties of varying styles and designs. Roof heights, layout, scale and massing of the building are also varied which adds interest to the area. Some houses are close to one of the side boundaries with the adjacent houses, there are also some large gaps between the houses, although the spacing is not regular. The properties are set back from the road with front gardens and parking, and there is a fairly strong building line which is an important characteristic of the street scene. Gardens contain mature planting and the area has a very pleasant suburban appearance. No 64 Alyth Road has a pitched roof and has a simple appearance with a single storey extension on both sides of the property. No 62 has a similar design although it is larger in bulk and mass. The proposal would involve the construction of a two storey front, side and rear extension.
5. I have been referred to the Council's Residential Extension Guide Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 2008. This sets out a number of principles for extensions. The design of the house would involve an increase in the roof height of the existing dwelling, and the introduction of a gable front to the extension. Whilst the scheme would increase the bulk of the house, I consider it would not affect the character of the house to a significant degree as it is of a sufficient size to absorb the changes proposed. The windows and doors would be reminiscent of the original design, and would be similar in size to the existing features. The scheme would ensure the retention of a significant proportion of the plot so that it would not be detrimental to the setting of the existing house.
6. The front gable would not be overly decorative, and would therefore maintain the simple design approach to the house. Although the front gable would come forward of the existing main elevation, the building line would remain largely intact. It would also add to the variety of features within the street scene, and would result in No 64 having a character distinct from No 62 which I consider would be acceptable. The dwelling would also have a similar scale and proportions to No 62, and the roof height and slope would be similar. The existing physical gap between No 62 and No 64 would be maintained, and the separation between No 66 which is a chalet bungalow would be retained. This would preserve the general context of the varied gaps between buildings. I have also had regard to the significant size and bulk of dwellings in close proximity to No 64. For these reasons I consider that the proposal would not be overly dominant in the street scene.
7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area or the existing dwelling. It would not be in conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012. This amongst other things seeks new development that should, through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings. It would not be contrary to the general thrust of the SPG.

Other matters

8. The Council does not object to the proposal in respect of the effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree with this.

Conclusion and conditions

9. I have considered the conditions in the light of the tests set out in paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Planning Practice Guidance. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. However, the west side elevation on drawing 002 Rev B shows the proposed side extension roof ridge height as being lower than shown in the other elevations. I have therefore attached a condition requiring the submission and approval of details of the proposed west side elevation.
10. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have attached a condition requiring the materials of the proposed extension to match that of the existing dwelling.
11. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that subject to the conditions set out above, the appeal should be allowed.

L Gibbons

INSPECTOR