
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2018

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 June 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3196372

304 Poole Lane, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH11 9DT

- 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 C Anderson against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-11820-D, dated 20 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor extension to dwellinghouse.
-

Application for Costs

1. An application for costs was made by the appellant against the Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first-floor extension to dwellinghouse at 304 Poole Lane, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH11 9DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2017-11820-D, dated 20 October 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: Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500 and Drg Nos 04-1-2017-00, 1006/04A, 1006/06 and 1006/06A.
 - 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling along a residential frontage that comprises a mix of dwelling types to this side of Poole Lane. The officer's report includes a section with the title '*Previous Relevant Planning Applications and Appeals*'. It lists just one application for '*Alterations and single-storey extension to dwellinghouse*' that was approved in February 2017 (Ref 7-2017-11820-C). However, the appellant has pointed out that planning permission was granted in October 2003 for '*Alterations and first floor extension to dwellinghouse – Revised application*' (Ref 7/2003/11820/B). That permission was not implemented and has lapsed. I have been provided with a copy of the decision notice and approved plans which appear identical to the current appeal proposal.
5. The Council is of the view that the proposed extension would be over large and dominant in the street scene and that it would appear cramped, leading to a terracing effect by reason of its position reaching up to the plot's side boundary.
6. The addition would add a second storey over an existing side extension. It would be recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation with its ridge line stepped below the height of the main ridge. Combined with its modest width, the extension would appear obviously subservient to the dwelling, which would remain dominant, allowing the original symmetry of the detached pair to prevail and the building to appear reasonably balanced. Its form and matching materials would complement the host dwelling with nothing about its proportions or appearance overall that would be overly large or incongruous.
7. The Council's '*Residential extensions - A Design Guide for Householders*' (September 2008) advises regarding side extensions that they should be set at least 1.0m off the side boundary of the property to make sure the street does not become cramped. However, the gap with the neighbouring property at No 302 would not be filled. No 302 is an end terrace with space between its flank wall and the side common boundary with No 304 that is inherently different in scale and function to that at the side of the appeal property. A repeat form of development at No 302 that could result in the properties immediately adjoining each other would be unlikely. Moreover, there is no regular pattern or rhythm to the gaps between buildings along this stretch of Poole Lane that would be lost or damaged.
8. Consistent with the decision that was taken in 2003, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area. I therefore find no conflict with the aims and objectives of the Design Guide, or with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012) insofar as it seeks to ensure that development is designed to respect the site and its surroundings. For these same reasons there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. In response to the appellant's claim of costs the Council has accepted that their decision notice quoted an erroneous plan. The condition I have imposed properly reflects the plans that were submitted to and

considered by the Council. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the works are carried out in materials to match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR