

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2017

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3181908
13 Townsville Road, Bournemouth BH9 3HL

- 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 Mooney against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-26582 was refused by notice dated 17 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as 'Raise in ridge height to allow for first floor habitable accommodation and two storey rear extension. Fenestration & elevation changes'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow on the south-west side of the street. It is one of a number of single storey properties between Claremont Avenue and the two storey dwellings towards the other end of Townsville Road. A number of the bungalows have gable ended front projections and there is some variation in ridge heights and eaves level, which is, on the whole, fairly modest.
 4. Nevertheless, as at the appeal site, the main roofs of these single storey properties have a hipped profile, sloping down at the front, as well as fairly short ridgelines, giving this part of the street a significant degree of consistency and cohesion. Despite the building and locality having no specific designation, such as a Conservation Area, there is a pleasantly repetitive appearance that contributes positively to the streetscene.
 5. The enlarged property would have a gabled front and rear elevation, with the ridge length of the roof increasing substantially. As a result, there would be an undue increase in the bulk and prominence of the dwelling, with it appearing incongruous, intrusive and overly dominant. It would also unacceptably detract from the rhythm and consistency of the streetscene.
 6. There are examples of hip to gable alterations of bungalows in the road. However, three of these planning permissions predate the adoption of the Council's Residential extensions, A Design Guide for Householders (DGH), September 2008. This advises that changing a pitched roof to a gable can only
-

be successfully achieved in certain locations. In some areas a continuous line of pitched roof contributes to the character of the area and therefore the insertion of a gable is inappropriate.

7. The Appellant points out that the permission at 26 Townsville Road was granted after the adoption of the DGH. However, at this time there were already three examples of such development approved on this side of the road. The context of the appeal scheme is significantly different as it would be a particularly isolated example with all the other similar alterations being on the opposite side of the street.
8. In consequence, I consider that the proposal would clearly conflict with the advice in the DGH and that the other cases of similar development lend no significant support to the appeal. I reach this conclusion regardless of the distance of the approved schemes from the two storey housing in the street. The Appellant also makes reference to a dormer window being built under permitted development rights at 8 Townsville Road. However, this is also on the other side of the road and there is nothing to show that it would include any hip to gable alteration as now proposed.
9. For the above reasons it is concluded that the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene would be harmed. This would be contrary to Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy, Adopted October 2012, Policy CS41 because of the failure to respect the surroundings.
10. Given the adverse impact on the cohesion of the streetscene, I consider that rejecting the appeal would be consistent with Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework where it is indicated that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. It is also a core principle that planning should always seek to secure high quality design, which would not be achieved in this instance.
11. It has not been argued that the development plan in this case is silent, absent or out of date. Moreover, I have found conflict with the development plan and in these circumstances the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework does not apply.
12. Given the harm that would result and taking account of all other matters raised, it is determined that the appeal fails. In reaching this decision I have carefully considered the submitted photographs and other material, including the drawings and Council reports relating to other development in the street, submitted by the Appellant. I have also taken into account the objections raised by a local resident.

M Evans

INSPECTOR