

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2018

**by Sue Glover BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 31 May 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3198154**  
**69 Norton Road, Bournemouth, BH9 2PZ**

- 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 Spendlove against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2018-25047-B was refused by notice dated 6 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is alterations and roof extensions with dormers to form a second floor level to the dwelling house (revised scheme).
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. This part of the street is characterised by regularly spaced detached houses of similar appearance with largely unaltered hipped roof slopes. In the wider locality, and at the corner of junctions, there are differing house types including dormer bungalows in Mansfield Road.
  4. The proposal to raise the main roof ridge by about 0.5m and increase the pitch, combined with the 2 side dormers, would significantly increase the scale of the roof compared to adjacent houses. The proposal would appear unduly bulky, conspicuous and out of place in the context of a row of dwellings of similar height and form. Despite matching roof materials, there would not be a high quality of design. I therefore find material harm to the character and appearance of the area.
  5. The proposal conflicts with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, which expects all development to be well designed and of a high quality, and to be designed to respect its surroundings. The development plan policy is compatible with the objectives of paragraphs 17 and 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek to secure a high quality of design and to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal does not meet the objectives of the Framework in these respects.
  6. The proposal also conflicts with the objectives of the adopted Residential Extensions, A Design Guide for Householders, which aims to ensure that all
-

proposals maintain or enhance the character of the existing house and its setting.

7. I am satisfied that any effect on the living conditions of the residents at nos. 67 and 71, including outlook, privacy, daylight and sunlight, would be no more than would reasonably be expected between adjacent dwellings in a suburban area, and would cause no material harm. Any access to adjacent properties to undertake works is a matter for the parties and is beyond the remit of this appeal. Any noise or dust disturbance from construction would be temporary only, and insufficient reason to withhold permission on these grounds.
8. I have taken into account all other matters, including the low internal ceiling height that would result from the permitted development scheme. Notwithstanding the appellants' 'fallback' scheme, I have judged this proposal on its own merits.
9. I have noted and taken account concerns raised by the appellant about some inaccuracies in the officer's report, and discussions that took place. The single storey rear extension was not part of the application to the Council, and therefore not part of this appeal. I have also taken into consideration examples of other extensions in the area.
10. I have considered all the policies in the Framework, and other national planning policy and guidance. Notwithstanding the other matters, the harm that I have identified to character and appearance is significant and overriding. The appeal therefore does not succeed.

*Sue Glover*

INSPECTOR