
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2017

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3180864

23 Clowes Avenue, Bournemouth BH6 4ER

- 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 Kilmister against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-26494-A, dated 6 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations, extensions, and installation of dormer windows to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Clowes Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac which contains detached properties that are set back from the road; this, along with the wide verges, has created an open and spacious character to the area. The style and size of the houses in the street varies considerably as does the spacing between the properties. However generally above ground floor level there is greater space between the dwellings which is a result of either many of the properties incorporating hipped roofs or single storey garages being located to the side of the dwellings.
4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling which, with its attached garage, covers almost all of the width of the plot. The house has a steeply sloping gable roof. It is set at a slight angle to and a little forward of the neighbouring No.21. This position has resulted in the property being more prominent in the street than many of its neighbours. The single storey nature of the garage is such that space has been created between the appeal property and the neighbouring house above ground floor level.
5. Various alterations and extensions are proposed to the dwelling, but, of particular concern to the Council, is the side extension. This would result in a first floor across the full width of the dwelling. It would reduce the gap between the appeal dwelling and the neighbouring house. Due to the offset angle and forward position of No.23 the relationship between the two properties would appear cramped. This would be particularly the case in views from the south where the dwelling, as extended, would appear dominant creating an

uncomfortable and crowded relationship between the two neighbouring houses. This would be uncharacteristic of the generally spacious arrangement at first floor level. The proposed half hip roof form would only modestly reduce the impact of this, but not to the extent that harm would not arise to the character and appearance of the area.

6. There are some examples on the street where there is not a significant gap between the houses above ground floor level. However generally these properties are either not offset or do not occupy as prominent a position in the street. The appeal property can also be seen to the back drop of closer packed housing in Southbourne Coast Road. These other examples do not have the same relationship with their neighbouring properties, and as such they do not persuade me that the appeal scheme is acceptable.
7. The existing garage is flat roofed with a small pitch roof form at its front. This is prominent in views when heading south towards the dwelling and it is not a design feature of any particular merit. This would be removed as part of the appeal scheme and, in itself, can be seen as a modest benefit but it would not outweigh the harm that would arise from the crowded relationship the development would create with the neighbouring property.
8. The development would not fully accord with the design guidance in the Council's *Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders* (the Design Guide) in that the ridge of the side extension would not be set down nor would the front wall be set back. However, the general design approach would result in a dwelling of a cohesive design. Given that the styles of properties in Clowes Avenue varies very considerably, I do not consider that, in itself, the failure to adhere to this guidance and the lack of subservience in the side extension would result in harm, although careful attention would need to be paid to the use of materials. I also note that the Design Guide states that it provides guidelines and that each case will be considered on its own merits. Similarly I do not consider that, in itself, the extension would be out of proportion to the host dwelling. However these factors do not outweigh or mitigate the cramped appearance that would result from the relationship of the development with No.21.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would be contrary to Policy CS41 of the *Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy* which seeks to ensure that new development respects the site and its surroundings and enhances local distinctiveness. It would also fail to accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other matters

10. I consider that the side extension would be sufficiently off-set from the neighbouring property, particularly the side dormer window, and that the rear extension would have a sufficiently low overall height so that harm would not result to the living conditions of the occupiers of that dwelling. This however is essentially a neutral factor and does little to weigh in favour of the development. There is a clear glazed window in the gable facing No.21 and there could be some minor benefits if obscure glazing were used for the windows in the side of the proposed extension. This, however, would not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. The adverse effects of the development are sufficient to mean that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. The benefits that would arise for the appellants through the additional living space for their family would not outweigh this harm. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR