The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2018

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday 13th April 2018.

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3193671
50 Browning Avenue, Bournemouth BH5 1NW

- 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 Laura Thomas against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 7-2017-9991-E, dated 10 August 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2017.
- The development proposed is for the erection of a side extension to form ancillary dependent relative annexe.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side extension to form ancillary dependent relative annexe at 50 Browning Avenue, Bournemouth BH5 1NW in accordance with the terms of application Ref. 7-2017-9991-E, dated 10 August 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: 9535/01C, 9535/02C, 9593/03C and 9535/04.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site is situated within a residential street generally comprising substantial two and two and a half storey houses set within generous plots. There is a variety of architecture within the area and notwithstanding the scale and bulk of some houses in the street, nonetheless there is a good degree of articulation.

4. There is an existing gap between the host dwelling and 52 Browning Road with a detached single storey garage serving the former which is constructed along the shared boundary. It is proposed to demolish the existing garage and construct a two storey extension in its place, albeit with a lower first floor level and correspondingly lower eaves and ridge line. A single storey lean-to element would be constructed against the boundary, thereby maintaining a degree of

separation at first floor level between the extension and the neighbouring dwelling.

5. I note that the Council's 'Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders (2008)' stipulates within paragraph 3.2 that side extensions which fill in the gaps between properties can result in a cramped appearance or give a terracing effect that is harmful to the character of the street. It goes on to say that where the spacing is very regular, and is a strong element of the character of a street, a side extension may not be appropriate, but in any case, such extensions should be set at least 1m off the side boundary of the property.

6. Whilst each case must be assessed on its own merits, the appellant has brought to my attention three not dissimilar proposals that have been approved by the Council where two storey built form is similar, if not slightly closer to a boundary, and demonstrates that the Design Guide is not always adhered to in a strict manner. Notwithstanding this, I consider that, bearing in mind the set-in of the first floor element of the proposal and the lower eaves and ridge line, that the extension would appear subservient to the host dwelling. I acknowledge that the extension would stretch rearward into the site a fair degree, but this would no deeper than the rear wing on the opposite side of the appeal dwelling. In any event, the built form of no 52 would, to some degree, shield this and whilst I accept that the fenestration to the rear is of a far more contemporary appearance than that on the rear elevation of the dwelling as it exists, this would act as a foil thereby clearly enabling one to identify the form of the original dwelling; further its visual impact upon the public realm would be limited.

7. In view of the above, I consider that the proposal would not introduce a cramped or unduly dominant feature in the street scene with it retaining an element of subservience to the host dwelling. Consequently, I find that no material conflict with the Design Guide or Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which requires all development to be well designed and of a high quality and through its scale, layout, siting and character and appearance to be designed to respect the site and its surroundings, whilst providing 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

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

9. Other than the standard time limit 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 interest of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed.

C J Tivey INSPECTOR