
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2018

by J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3200036

4 Batcombe Close, Bournemouth BH11 8PG

- 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 Nugent against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2018-23345-A, dated 5 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2018.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the first floor side extension upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 4 Batcombe Close is a detached house within a residential estate comprising mostly similar aged and styled houses. There are clusters of house types within the estate, and those in Batcombe Close share the same characteristics as those in the cul-de-sac to the east. Most of the houses within Batcombe Close overlook a large area of public open space. The elevated position of the cul-de-sac and its proximity to the open space, make the houses along it a very prominent row within the estate that can be seen for some distance.
4. In addition to the repeated style and size of the detached houses is the regular spacing between the buildings. The houses are flush to the shared boundary on one side, whilst to the other side of the plots are flat-roofed garages and narrow pathways that separate each house from its neighbour. Even the presence of semi-detached houses within the row maintains the rhythm of the separation. The spacing of the houses, along with their repeated forms and style gives a harmonious appearance to this cul-de-sac and also that to the rear.
5. The provision of a first floor side extension above the garage would harmfully erode the homogeneity of the dwellings within these cul-de-sacs. Some of the houses have been altered, but in most cases the distinctive first floor breaks above the flat roofed garages has been maintained, providing views through to the rear gardens and to those behind them. Although the access path would

remain, the height and close proximity of the first floor flank wall would harmfully disrupt the pattern of separation between the dwellings and erode the rhythmical spaciousness. Moreover, the side path is very narrow and the resultant cramped proximity of the buildings at first floor level would make the extended building harmfully different and thereby prominent within the street scene.

6. Furthermore, the detached houses have relatively narrow front and rear elevations under shallow gabled roofs. The extension would have a brick pier, similar styled windows, and exterior cladding to match that found on the host building. These are positive aspects of the scheme. However, the size and form of the extension, particularly the roof would be overly large and dominant. The long length of the roof with its ridge at the same level and perpendicular to that of the existing building would be an incongruous and bulky juxtaposition to the shallow gabled roof of the existing house.
7. The appellants have drawn my attention to another first floor side extension in Batcombe Close, and also to two appeal decisions. With the former, I saw at my visit that there were similarities of size and form to that proposed. Nevertheless being close to the end of the cul-de-sac and lower down the hillside this house does not have such a prominent position as No 4. Moreover, I do not have the full planning history of this house before me to ascertain whether it is directly comparable.
8. As regards the appeal decisions, from the evidence provided they are very different to the scheme for No 4. One of the decisions is for a front extension, and in both cases there are a variety of differences to the scheme before me, including context. Furthermore, each case has to be treated on its individual merits in accordance with the requirements of the current development plan and all other material considerations, as I have undertaken in this instance.
9. Thus, the first floor side extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), and the guidance in the Council's Residential Extensions design guide (2008). These seek amongst other things, high quality development that respects the site and its surroundings, thereby reflecting objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. Finally, the appellants have raised a number of issues regarding the Council's handling of the application, including the assessment of the scheme and inconsistent decision making. I appreciate such matters would be of concern but they have to be pursued by other means separate from the appeal process and are not for me to consider with regard to the planning considerations of this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans INSPECTOR