

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2018

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1255/D/18/3209905

21 Broadhurst Avenue, Bournemouth, BH10 6JW

- 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 Bowden against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2018-9568-B, dated 17 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as "*Raise ridge height with dormers & a new roof over the garage to form habitable accommodation on the first floor with a rear extension*".
-

Preliminary Matter

1. The appeal form gives the name of the local planning authority as the Borough of Poole Council. The application was made to, and determined by, Bournemouth Borough Council. I am satisfied that this is the correct local planning authority.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on: - (i) the character and appearance of the area, and (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring and nearby occupiers with particular regard to visual impact and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow set within a row of five properties along a short stretch of Broadhurst Avenue to its southern side that runs between Brockley Road and Brierly Road. Although there is some variation to the style of these properties, they form a group that has a pleasing harmony within the street scene, due principally to their fairly uniform front building lines and the consistency of their hipped roof forms, with the reasonably short span of their individual ridge lines open to clear view from Broadhurst Avenue.
-

5. Part of the proposal would involve raising the height of the ridge, albeit by only a small margin, but also projecting the roof forward to create a cropped gable to the front elevation. This feature would stand proud of the hipped roofs to the other adjacent properties. In my assessment it would be seen within the street scene as an intrusive addition that would reflect the type of change that part 3 of the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled *Residential Extensions - A Design Guide for Householders September 2008* specifically advises against. The uncharacteristic nature of the roof within its surroundings would be exaggerated by the extension to the rear, which would further elongate the ridge to a size that would emphasise the scale of the new works, making them appear incongruous and out of step with the other dwellings in the group.
6. No 21 has a garage extension to the side that is deeply recessed and attached to the dwelling at its rear corner, and which projects deep into the reasonably shallow rear garden. The garage has a flat roof with a dummy pitch to the front and extends right up to the plot's side boundary with 19 Broadhurst Avenue. It is proposed to square off the building by extending into space to the rear of the existing dwelling, currently occupied in part by a modest conservatory extension, and linking the addition to the garage, with a pitched roof over both elements that would be fully integrated with the new roof over the main part of the dwelling.
7. These works to the roof at the rear would add considerable bulk and mass to the dwelling. I accept that due to its position, the roof over the garage would not be widely seen from Broadhurst Avenue. However, it would not be completely undetected and when viewed head-on, the enlarged dwelling would be clearly seen to span the width of the plot. The low-rise form of the existing garage helps to create a gap with No 19 at first-floor level that in turn contributes to a degree of spacing between the properties, enabling them to sit comfortably in relation to each other and the wider street scene. This would be lost, and I am not persuaded that the hipped form of the roof over the garage would be sufficient to avoid the appeal property appearing cramped in its setting.
8. Although there are numerous dormer windows also proposed, these would all be modest in their individual sizes and would sit comfortably within the roof slopes. Nevertheless, I share the Council's view that by reason of the form, size, bulk, and position of the roof alterations, the proposal as a whole would appear out of keeping and harmful to the street scene.
9. I am aware that there are cases where hipped roof bungalows have been permitted to change the form of their roofs and I have taken note of two such examples at Nos 16 and 18 Broadhurst Avenue opposite the appeal site. However, the northern side of Broadhurst Avenue is markedly more disparate in character due in no small part to the presence of The Crown Public House, which has an imposing presence as an entirely different entity in terms of its appearance and use. The mixed architecture to this side of the road is further reinforced by the different dwelling types that flank each side of the PH. Such diversity is not reflected opposite where there is a far greater sense of uniformity to the pattern of development and which would be unacceptably harmed.

Living Conditions

10. The existing garage to No 21 projects well beyond the rear elevation to No 19. Its height already extends noticeably above the approximate 2m high fence that runs between both properties along the shared side boundary. Although the new roof over would pitch away from No 19, the proposal would add considerably to the scale and bulk of building at an elevated level and at immediately close quarters. This would be clearly seen from the adjoining garden and would impose itself as a dominant and intrusive presence, and one that would add an unreasonable degree of enclosure to a relatively small private garden area.
11. In a similar vein, the new extension to the rear of No 21 would project well beyond the rear elevation of No 23 and immediately adjacent to the common boundary to that side of the appeal site. Although No 23 has a detached garage to the rear and which also adjoins the boundary, this has a flat roof and is modest in size and visual impact, being set away from the rear elevation of No 23. The excessive bulk and height of the new extension would be clearly seen from the adjoining garden of this property and would impose itself on the neighbours to this side as a dominant and intrusive presence, and one that would add an unreasonable degree of enclosure to another relatively small garden.
12. Due to the small garden depth to No 21, the two dormer windows to the rear would both provide an outlook at first floor level towards adjoining rear gardens in Brockley Road and Brierly Road. This would give the potential for sight directly into these gardens with a subsequent loss of privacy, particularly in relation to No 23 Brockley Road, the rear of which is angled facing towards the rear of the appeal property.
13. Given the fairly compact and tightly knit arrangement for the dwellings that are grouped around No 21, to the sides and the rear, I find the scale and bulk of the proposed extensions to the rear, and the introduction of windows at first floor level in close proximity to the rear boundaries, would combine to have a significantly detrimental impact upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

14. I have found that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. I have also found that it would harm the living conditions of adjoining and nearby occupiers. There would therefore be conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which seeks to ensure that all development is designed to respect the site and its surroundings and the amenities of neighbouring residents.
15. I appreciate that the proposal would create a larger family home that would cater for multi-generational needs, but this does not outweigh the harm that I have identified and the conflict with the development plan. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR