

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2019

**by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3213973**  
**148 Hill View Road, Bournemouth, BH10 5BJ**

- 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 and Mrs Hoarder against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2018-27074, dated 21 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2018.
  - The development proposed is to raise roof and insert dormers to create additional first floor accommodation and to erect a rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to raise roof and insert dormers to create additional first floor accommodation and to erect a rear extension at 148 Hill View Road, Bournemouth, BH10 5BJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2018-27074, dated 21 June 2018, 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: Drg Nos J18021 001, J18021 002, and J18021 003 Rev A.
  - 3) The proposed bathroom and en-suite windows in the dormer extension to the north (side) elevation of the building and facing 150 Hill View Road shall be fitted with obscure glass and shall be permanently retained as such.

## Procedural Matter

2. As part of the appeal the appellants have submitted an amended plan, Drg No J18021 003 Rev A. This shows an existing shallow front bay window retained as part of the proposal with a modified roof over. I am satisfied that this change does not materially alter the nature of the original application and that

interested parties would not be prejudiced by my acceptance of these plans; my reasoning for doing so being set out below.

## **Main Issues**

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and upon the living conditions at 150 Hill View Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

## **Reasons**

### *Character and Appearance*

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with a hipped roof over the main part of the dwelling and a subservient, off-centre gable feature to the front. It sits amongst a run of similar type properties that display a degree of regimentation between them. However, the wider street scene is mixed, as was recognised by the appeal Inspector in October 2016 in relation to a proposal to modify the modest bungalow form of No 176 (Appeal Ref APP/G1250/D/16/3156049). Properties on the west side of the road display variety in terms of their scale, form and appearance. Several on the east side have been changed markedly beyond their common origins. Although I recognise that the previous Inspector's observations were particularly directed towards properties on the east side of Hill View Road and near to its northern end, from my own observations I saw that No 148 sits near to others that extend in a southerly direction away from the appeal site and which are noticeably more varied in their form, either in terms of their original design or by later modification, as is the case at No 144. There are properties with ridge heights taller than others, dormer windows to the front and sides on some, and others with full height gables to their front elevations. Contrary to the Council's view, I find that these differences appear well assimilated into the wider street scene where some variation, especially in relation to the roof configuration of the property, has become part of its character.
5. The appeal proposal would include raising the ridge height of the existing dwelling and changing the main hipped roof to a gable. The increased height of No 148 would match that at No 144, just two doors away, as would the pitch of the roof and the gable end. None of these changes would appear particularly strident within the context of the surroundings.
6. The inclusion of glazing to the apex of the gable would merely impart some contemporary detailing and in my view would not serve to emphasise any unacceptable feature. Because the entrance to the dwelling is to one side, the originally proposed loss of the bay window would have resulted in a relatively featureless ground floor front elevation. The appellants' suggestion to reinstate the bay would ensure that an appropriate level of correlation with other properties to this side of the road would be maintained and is an improvement to the original proposal.
7. The dormers to each side of the new roof would be modest in size and well recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation. They would not be prominent within the street scene.

8. The Council's *Residential Extensions - A Design Guide for Householders* (September 2008) expresses caution where the introduction of a gable end in a row of properties with pitched roofs can make the property appear over dominant in the street scene and generally unacceptable. But for the reasons I have explained, I am satisfied that the gable roof design and overall scale of the changes to No 148 would appear as an appropriate alteration, neither incongruous nor overly dominant within the street scene. As such, the proposal would typify an example where the change of a pitched roof to a gable in the manner proposed can be successfully assimilated into the area. There would therefore be no conflict with the Council's 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.

#### *Living Conditions*

9. The Council is satisfied that the proposal would have no impact upon the living conditions at 146 Hill View Road (incorrectly referred to as No 142 in the officer's report). As No 146 has a deeper building line compared with No 148, and the proposed dormer to this side would look directly towards the neighbouring property's opposing roof, I have no reason to disagree.
10. The north side elevation of the appeal property runs along the common boundary between Nos 148 and 150. The proposal includes a rearward extension of No 148 with a commensurate projection of the roof over at full height. This would undeniably add bulk to the side profile of the existing dwelling, but the eaves height would not change, and the dwelling would remain as a well-proportioned building appropriate to its setting and comparable in scale to others in the area.
11. The increased depth of No 148 would have the potential to be seen from the rear conservatory extension to No 150 and from side facing windows and doors. However, this adjoining dwelling is set away from the common boundary and the principal outlook to the rear from the adjacent living space would remain over the neighbour's own garden and unaffected in this regard by the proposal. I am satisfied that the proposal would not appear oppressive or overbearing in relation to the living spaces or garden to No 150. The proposed dormer windows to this side would serve a bathroom and en-suite and could both reasonably be obscurely glazed by condition.
12. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no impact upon No 150 that would seriously affect the neighbour's living conditions. As such there would be no conflict with Policy CS41 insofar as it relates to amenity.

#### **Conditions**

13. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. This includes the revised drawing which shows the front bay window retained. The proposal is explicitly to use render for the walls in place of the existing brick finish. The external finishes of other properties in the area are mixed. I therefore see no reason why the materials should match the existing building, as suggested by the Council. To safeguard the living conditions at

150 Hill View Road it is necessary to control the glazing to be fitted within the dormer extensions to this side.

**Conclusion**

14. For the reasons given, the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions at 150 Hill View Road. 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