

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2018

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday 13th April 2018.

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3192518

51 Baring Road, Southbourne, Bournemouth, Dorset BH6 4DT

- 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 Ms Sarah Willett against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-26792, dated 21 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is for alterations and extensions to dwelling and garage and development of the roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to dwelling and garage and development of the roof space at 51 Baring Road, Southbourne, Bournemouth, Dorset BH6 4DT in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 7-2017-26792, dated 21 September 2017 subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 Site Location Plan, 1:500 Site Plan, 2313/01A, 2313/02A, 2313/03A and 2313/04A.
 3. 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.
 4. The roof extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the side dormer windows have been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of those windows that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which they are to be installed shall be capable of being opened. Details of the type of obscured glazing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before the window is installed and once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within a residential street of detached dwellings, consisting of bungalows and chalet bungalows on the north western side of Baring Road and two storey houses to its south eastern side. The majority of bungalows retain their original four sided hipped roofs with short ridgelines, although many have had dormer windows installed, with others such as at 59 Baring Road being extended in a more extensive and contemporary fashion.
4. The proposal would clearly elongate the existing ridgeline of no 51, although this would not be significant, the appeal dwelling must be viewed within its immediate context which includes 53 and 55 Baring Road which have forward projections which elongate their roofs, albeit at a lower height. The depth of ridgelines also varies due south west of the appeal site. Opposite at 48 – 52 and 58 Baring Road are two storey houses with bonnet hips which the proposal before me seeks to emulate. Overall, I consider that the design of the proposed extensions is of a good quality with fenestration and side dormer roof extensions which are sympathetic to the line of bungalows within which the appeal site finds itself situated. I also note that the schedule of proposed materials, as set out upon drawing 2313/04A is in harmony with the prevailing palette of materials utilised within the locality.
5. I acknowledge that the existing roof form that would be extended would contrast to some degree against the more restrained roof profiles to the flanking dwellings and that the cropped front gable addition would introduce a vertical aspect to the front elevation. However, whilst clearly first floor accommodation would be provided, it would still be of a chalet type design, i.e. of one and a half, rather than full two storeys. The proposed fenestration would give the proposal a more contemporary appearance, I have seen other such examples in relative close proximity to the appeal dwelling and, therefore, it would not be out of character with the locality.
6. I therefore find that notwithstanding the elongation of the ridge line and the form of the additions to the existing roof, the proposal would not be out of keeping with the overall character of the street scene, and therefore the character and appearance of the surrounding area would be protected. The proposal complies with one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (the "Framework") which is to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. I find no conflict either with Framework's paragraph 7 or 9 which set out the three dimensions to sustainable development, as well as seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built environment respectively.
7. I find that the proposal complies with Basic Principle 1 as set out within paragraph 2.2 of the Council's 'Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders (2008)' which requires proposals to maintain or enhance the character of the existing house and its setting. I acknowledge that paragraph 3.3 of the Guidance highlights that whilst changing the whole profile of the roof form can be highly visible in the street scene and is not always an appropriate solution for loft conversions, it does acknowledge that changing a pitch roof to a gable (or in this case a bonnet gable) can only be successfully achieved in certain locations; I consider that this is one such location where this is the case.

8. I also find that the proposal complies with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which highlights that the Council will seek to ensure that all development and spaces are well designed and of a high quality and that development should, through its scale, layout, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings, provide a high standard of amenity to meet the day-to-day requirements of future occupants, and contribute positively to the appearance and safety of the public realm.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
10. Other than the standard time condition, the Council has suggested a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the extensions to match those of the existing building. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, this is an appropriate condition. In addition, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out with the approved plans is imposed.
11. I note the third party representation which has been acknowledged by the Council in respect of the potential for overlooking from the proposed side dormer windows. In view of the fact that these would serve a bathroom and a landing area, I consider that the living conditions of the future occupants of the appeal dwelling, as well as the existing and future occupants of both neighbouring dwellings would be protected from overlooking, provided that the windows within these dormers are obscurely glazed and fixed shut for the first 1.7m above the respective first floor level. I consider the imposition of such a condition to be necessary in order to meet the tests as set out within the Planning Practice Guidance.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR