
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2018

by David Richards BSocSci DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3181016
24 Carey Road, Bournemouth, BH9 2XB

- 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 Stephen Pratt against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-11394-A, dated 19 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is alterations, formation of dormer window and conversion of roof to dwelling house to form second floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations, formation of dormer window and conversion of roof to dwelling house to form second floor level at 24 Carey Road, Bournemouth, BH9 2XB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2017-11394-A, dated 19 April 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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: Drawing Nos 1625-00 Rev C; 1625-01 Rev C; 1625-03 Rev C.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as specified in Section 11 of the planning application form dated 19 April 2017, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

2. While there was some objection from neighbours at the planning application stage, these were not specific. There were no neighbour objections received at appeal stage. The Council considered issues of privacy and overlooking but determined that there would be no unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbours. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (CS) requires that all developments should be well designed and of a high quality, respecting the

- site and its surroundings through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance.
4. The area is characterised by 1930s style two storey detached properties that are relatively similar in appearance, though there is some variety in external features such as bay window, porches and external materials. The proposal is to add a second floor level by raising the ridge height by 1 metre and altering the shape of the roof from hipped to cropped gable. A large window would be inserted in the front second floor level, with a single window at the rear, a flat roofed dormer on the south west side elevation and a rooflight to the north east side.
 5. The proposed alterations would result in a significant change to the appearance of the dwelling and its contribution to the streetscene. Notwithstanding the variety of finish, and changes such as the insertion of uPVC windows, dwellings in the area display a pleasant uniformity in scale and design, and the area has a similarly homogenous character. There are a relatively few examples of additions to the roof in the surrounding roads, and none of the type proposed here. Those which have occurred and were drawn to my attention by the Appellant were not necessarily successful in design terms, resulting in some unsightly compromises which have detracted from the character of the host dwellings and the surrounding area.
 6. In contrast there is evidence that the appeal scheme has been carefully considered and represents a step forward in comparison with the somewhat ad hoc design approach adopted in the other examples. While acknowledging the change to the appearance of the dwelling, I do not consider that the proposed cropped gable would be unattractive in its own right, or would appear over-dominant or unsightly in the streetscene. With regard to the side dormer, it would be set back from the front and rear elevations of the property and would have little effect in views along the street, other than from the immediate vicinity of No 24 itself and dwellings opposite. Evenso it would be a recessive feature and not over dominant in the streetscene. In my opinion the overall scheme represents an acceptable design solution which would enable the Appellant to realise his reasonable aspiration to adapt the dwelling to meet current needs.
 7. For these reasons, I do not consider that the scheme would result in material conflict with Policy CS41 of the CS. I acknowledge that the Council's 2008 design guidance: Residential Extensions (section on roof alterations) advises that dormers with a horizontal emphasis and flat roofs should be avoided, and that continuous pitched roof designs can make a contribution to the character of the area. However, for the reasons given I do not consider that the design of the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the streetscene in this instance.
 8. Accordingly, I allow the appeal.
 9. In addition to the time limit for commencement, a condition specifying the approved plans is needed to define the permission, and a condition in respect of materials is needed to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

David Richards

INSPECTOR