

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2017

by Ray Wright BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/16/3167714
54 Thornbury Road, Bournemouth BH6 4HT

- 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 Dronsfield against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-26396 was refused by notice dated 2 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a 'new roof with accommodation.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a detached bungalow within a group of similar properties. The main building has a pyramidic, hipped roof with a small front projection. The proposal is for a roof extension to form 'cropped' gables to both the front and rear elevations with a dormer on the south east roof slope. This would create a new bedroom, with en-suite and dressing room at first floor level.
 4. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) indicates there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development, but confirms good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that development of poor design, which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, should be refused.
 5. Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan : Core Strategy 2012 (CS) similarly requires high quality design which respects the site and its surroundings, indicating that development which, by virtue of its design, would be detrimental to the built environment will not be permitted.
 6. The 'Residential Extensions - A Design Guide for Householders' Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) provides more detailed advice.
 7. While the wider area contains a mix of properties, the appeal dwelling is within a group of single storey bungalows, with similar buildings on the opposite side of the road. Within this immediate group the main original roof forms appear to
-

have been retained with few incursions at first floor level. The only obvious exception appears to be no 39 Thornbury Road which has a dormer window, but this is set well within its overall roof space and the ridge height appears comparable with adjoining unaltered dwellings.

8. The appeal property, due to its size and design, currently has a low key presence and relates well to nearby dwellings which all appear to date from a similar period. The existing form of the property would be considerably altered by the appeal proposal. In particular, the overall scale of the roof would be completely changed, with the ridge line raised and the original hipped form totally subsumed. The consequent bulk and mass at first floor level would be significant. The roof would become a visually strident element of the building, the impact of which would not be reduced by the proposed 'cropped' gables to front and rear. As proposed, the extensive roof of the building would be clearly visible from the public realm, would rise above the adjoining properties and represent a conspicuous feature.
9. The proposed front elevation would, due to its height and proportions, represent a far more prominent element of the building, uncharacteristic of the simple architectural style of the existing bungalows in this section of the road. This property would become a dominant building in this group of bungalows, which would, consequently, be incongruous and out of keeping in its setting.
10. I have noted the appellant's analysis of other properties in Thornbury Road, the six specific dwellings where 'different profiles have been approved' and, in addition, the three buildings with gables at 66, 68 and 70 Thornbury Road. I do not have any specific details relating to all these properties and when changes have to been made to their original form. However, in any event, I have considered this appeal on its individual merits, based on the specific scheme put forward and the immediate townscape surroundings.
11. While I appreciate the appellant's desire for a 'better quality home' and note the 'other publications of National advice' put forward to support the scheme, these do not outweigh the clear harm to the street scene that I have identified.
12. Due to the overall scale of the changes, the proposed development would not suitably relate to its surroundings and would be out of place with other properties in this section of the road. Overall, I conclude the development proposed would harm the character and appearance of the area and, as such, is contrary to the Framework, Policy CS41 of the CS and SPG.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ray Wright

INSPECTOR