
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2018

by Andrew Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3209310
23 Clowes Avenue, Bournemouth BH6 4ER

- 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 R Kilmister against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2018-26494-B, dated 15 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling at 23 Clowes Avenue, Bournemouth BH6 4ER in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2018-26494-B, dated 15 March 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following approved plans: 2017-08-04 rev B Site Plan; 2017-08-07 A Floor Plans as Proposed and 2017-08-09 rev A Elevations as Proposed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr & Mrs Robin Kilmister against Bournemouth Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the extended rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. Clowes Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac, which contains a range of large detached properties. These are set back a considerable distance from the road with wide verges and front gardens, giving the area a spacious character. Most of the properties are individually designed and are generally of single storey and one and a half storey forms, with many forms of dormer and roof extensions. The appeal property has steeply pitched roofs with gables, with an overall height that is slightly higher than its immediate neighbours.

5. The proposal relates to a number of alterations to the property. I have considered the previous appeal decision relating to similar alterations (ref APP/G1250/D/17/3180864). This appeal was dismissed due to the cramped appearance that would result between the appeal property and No 21 Clowes Avenue. The Council is satisfied that the current proposal has addressed this concern. The current area of concern to the Council, as set out in its reason for refusal, is the extension of an existing rear dormer window. This matter will therefore be the focus of my considerations.
6. There are two dormers at the back of the existing property. One is very large, rising up directly off the back wall and making up the bulk of the existing first floor accommodation. The other is a more conventional small dormer window. The proposal would extend the width of the larger dormer, to cover the smaller one. It is possible to glimpse the end of the existing dormers from the road, but from this angle it is not possible to gauge how large these elements of the property are. The sketch submitted by the appellants indicates that the proposed roof over the garage would obscure views of the extended dormer from the road. I have no reason to disagree with this.
7. I do accept that the dormer as extended would be a dominant feature when viewed from the rear garden of the property, and could be considered to cause harm to the original roof form of the dwelling from this perspective by virtue of its lack of subservience and overall bulk. I also accept that the dormer would have a fairly odd relationship with the proposed single storey extension, although the presence of the single storey extension would reduce the bulk of the dormer to some extent. Section 3.3 of the Council's Residential Design Guide seeks to ensure that dormer extensions are appropriately designed. However, whilst it is of no particular design merit, the extended dormer would only be seen from the rear garden of the property, and the private rear areas of a few neighbouring properties, and must be considered in the context of the bulky dormer that already exists. Failure to strictly adhere to the Council's design guidance would not cause harm in this instance.
8. I disagree with the Council's suggestion that the use of cladding would make matters worse. The use of a contrasting natural material would provide some visual contrast between the dormer and the area of render below, which would help to reduce the bulk of the dormer.
9. The Council is also concerned about the placement of windows on the rear elevation, suggesting that this would be unbalanced. However I am of the view that there is no apparent design formality to the rear of the property at present. The proposed reconfiguration of openings, including the new window in the extended dormer, would accord with the current informal arrangement.
10. Taking all of these matters into account I am satisfied that the extended dormer would not cause harm to the wider character and appearance of the area. This accords with the National Planning Practice Framework and policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), which seek to ensure that development is well designed and of a high quality.

Other matters

11. Several neighbours commented on the proposal when it was under consideration by the Council. Matters raised include the impact on their living conditions (including concern about a further functioning chimney), concerns

about the design and parking provision. I have carefully considered all of the matters raised. The Council has considered the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbours and has not raised any issues. I agree with this assessment; the relationship between the existing property, the proposals and the neighbouring properties are such that living conditions of neighbouring occupiers would not be harmed. The control of fumes from the additional chimney could be dealt with by other legislation. In terms of design, I am satisfied that the various elements of the proposal are appropriate, and accord with the varied design and appearance of properties in the area, without harming the area's character and appearance. I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment of the proposal in relation to adequate parking provision.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the various planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
13. The Council suggested a condition to require materials and colours of the external surfaces of the extension to match the existing property. I am satisfied that the details relating to materials as set out in the application form are adequate, so this condition is not necessary.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above and having had regard to all other matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should succeed and planning permission should be granted.

Andrew Tucker

Inspector