
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3169506

162 Kingswell Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH10 5DW

- 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 Adrian Flagg against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2016-6324-J, dated 14 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations, formation of dormer window and extensions to bungalow to include forming first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations, formation of dormer window and extensions to bungalow to include forming first floor level at 162 Kingswell Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH10 5DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2016-6324-J, dated 14 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) 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.
 - iii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 162-02-A, 162-03-B, 162-04-A, 162-05-B, 162-06-A and 162-07-A.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Adrian Flagg against Bournemouth Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council, in its decision notice, refers to its Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders document. I have afforded this some weight due to its role in supporting the relevant development plan policy.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
-

- i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area;
- ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 160 and 164 Kingswell Road in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

- 5. The alteration of the rear roof form from the current hipped design to a gable would run counter to the design of most other dwellings in the vicinity. However, it would only be to the rear elevation, and set well back from the street where it would be largely screened from the front by those dwellings either side. As such it would not be prominent feature of Kingswell Road's streetscene.
- 6. The extent of the roof extension would be significant. However, it would be rearwards only and no higher than the existing roof. The proposed side dormer would be fairly bulky due to its flat roof design and only being set slightly down from the ridge and up from the eaves. However, it would be set well back from the front of the house. As such, it would not be a dominating feature of the house or streetscene, especially as it would be largely screened by other built form on the approaches to the site.
- 7. For these reasons, the integrity of the more visible and characteristically hipped existing roofscape at the front of the house would be retained in vistas along the street.
- 8. The extended and gable ended roof would be visible from Kingswell Gardens to the rear of the site. However this would be over intervening gardens and so set well away from the road. Furthermore, the proposed dormer, being significantly set back from the rear elevation, would be unlikely to be seen as a dominant feature. It would therefore be unlikely that the extension would be a prominent feature as seen from that street, particularly as it would be no higher than the existing main roof of the house.
- 9. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, in respect of this issue, it would accord with policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (the Core Strategy) and the Design Guide which together, amongst other things, require development to be designed to respect the site and surroundings.

Living conditions

- 10. The proposed extension would project beyond the rear of the existing bungalow by 4 metres on the side adjacent to No 160. This would be a similar distance beyond the nearest part of the rear elevation of that neighbouring property which includes a fairly large bay window to a habitable room. However, it would also be set off the boundary and so would only be generally seen at a fairly oblique angle from that room. That, together with the fairly modest, single storey, eaves height and roof sloping away from the boundary would prevent it from having an overbearing or unacceptably enclosing effect in terms of the outlook from that room. Those factors of separation from the boundary,

eaves height and roof slope would also be likely to prevent those same effects in terms of outlook from the rear garden and conservatory of No 160.

11. Due to the staggered rear elevation of No 162, the proposed extension would be deeper on the side of the dwelling nearest to No 164. However, that neighbouring dwelling is set away from the side boundary with its main rear elevation slightly beyond the line of that nearest part of No 162. Those factors, together with the sloping roof away from the boundary and fairly modest eaves height would prevent an overbearing or unacceptably enclosing effect when seen from the rear of that property also. Additionally, it would, to an extent, be separated from the rear garden of No 164 by that property's rear outbuilding adjacent to the boundary, which would further lessen its visual impact from that space.
12. The proposed dormer would be set well away from the rear elevation of the proposed extension and not beyond the main rear elevation of No 164. As such, it would not be prominent in the rear outlook from No 164.
13. No 164 does have a side habitable room window towards the rear of the house. However, the outlook from there is currently already impeded to an extent by the side elevation of No 162. The retained existing eaves height and away sloping roof of the proposal, other than in respect of the section containing the proposed dormer, together with the degree of separation between the two dwellings, would be further mitigating factors.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude on this issue that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 160 and 164 Kingswell Road in respect of outlook. As such, in respect of this issue, it would accord with policy CS41 of the Core Strategy and the Design Guide which together, amongst other things, require development not to be detrimental to amenity.

Other matters

15. I have had regard to concerns raised about a loss of light to No 160. The north-north-easterly aspect to the rear would ensure that the proposal would be unlikely to cause a material reduction in sunlight to the rear habitable rooms and garden of No 160. This would be particularly so due to the set-off from the boundary and the roof sloping away from that neighbouring property with a fairly modest eaves height. Those factors would also be likely to prevent any material loss of natural daylight to that adjacent property.

Conditions

16. The Council has suggested three conditions that it considers would be appropriate were I minded to allow the appeal. I have considered these in the light of advice in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. The standard time condition would be necessary and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would be required. In the interests of the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, a condition to ensure that the proposed materials relating to external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building would also be necessary.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR