

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2019

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

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

**Decision date: 1 February 2019**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/18/3215843**

### **72 Baring Road, Bournemouth, BH6 4DT**

- 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 Andrew Roberts against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2018-24947-B, dated 25 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2018.
  - The development proposed is the erection of an extension and loft conversion.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an extension and loft conversion at 72 Baring Road, Bournemouth, BH6 4DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2018-24947-B, dated 25 August 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 18-RG/234/201, 18-RG/234/202, 18-RG/234/203 C, 18-RG/234/204 C and 18-RG/234/205.
  - 3) The proposed bathroom window in the dormer extension to the side elevation of the building and facing 74 Baring Road shall be fitted with obscure glass and fixed shut below 1.7m. The window shall be permanently retained as such.

## **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

## **Reasons**

3. The appeal property is a detached, two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof. It has a two-storey projecting bay window to one side of the front elevation with a subservient hipped roof over. The proposal includes extending the property at full height to the rear, with a cropped gabled roof over, and creating new

living space at second floor level involving a gabled elevation to the front and a new side dormer window.

4. The Council properly recognises that properties along Baring Road differ in architectural style and design. Despite the hipped roof form of No 72, prominent gables feature heavily within the street scene and especially along this side of Baring Road, where there is no obvious rhythm or regimentation to the pattern of development other than a broadly consistent forward building line and space between the dwellings.
5. No 74, to one side of the appeal property, is a chalet style dwelling but with a full two-storey, centrally positioned gabled projection to its front elevation. No 70 on the opposite side has a two-storey front gable off-set to one side and adjacent to the boundary with the appeal property. The suggestion within the Council's reason for the refusal that the development would introduce a gable within a row of properties that feature only pitched roofs is therefore something that I did not recognise during my visit. I appreciate that the proposed gable would span the full width of the front elevation, but this would not be unique along Baring Road, with two properties nearby, on both sides at its junction with Harbour Road, that have been remodelled in very contemporary styles and which display very prominent gable features that dominate the roof forms of each dwelling.
6. The works would involve just a fractional increase in height to the roof and the pitch of the side roof slopes would not alter. Although the proposal would alter the profile of the roof, there is nothing particular about the existing arrangement or wider context that suggests change to the appearance of the appeal property could not be supported. The introduction of a gable would not be alien to the area and, regardless of what extent of original roof would be retained, I am satisfied the remodelled form of No 72 would not appear particularly strident or out of keeping with the mixed appearance of its surroundings.
7. The dormer to the side would be modest in size and proportion, and well recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation. It would not be prominent or intrusive within the street scene, where dormers of various sizes, designs and positions exist.
8. The Council is concerned that the use of cladding to the apex of the gable and dormer cheeks would be jolting and out of keeping with materials used in the area. I disagree. Render and brickwork undeniably prevail, but not to an extent that imparts any important sense of cohesion to the street scene. The use of materials varies from one property to the next, albeit from within a fairly limited palette, especially to this side of the road. However, No 74 is a case in point where tile hanging has been used for the first-floor finish to its gable, illustrating how individual preferences can assimilate successfully into the area. The use of cladding is not an unusual choice for a contemporary remodel to an existing dwelling. In this instance it would merely contribute to the variety in architectural style and design along Baring Road.
9. 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 gabled roof design and choice of materials at No 72 would appear as an appropriate alteration, neither incongruous nor overly dominant within the street scene. 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. For these same reasons I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it deals with the quality of design.

### **Conditions**

10. A condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty. The proposal is explicitly to use render for the walls apart from the areas of cladding already identified and black slate roofing materials in place of the existing concrete interlocking tiles. Given the mix of external finishes locally I see no reason why the materials should match the existing building, or why the render and cladding should match in colour, as suggested by the Council. To safeguard the living conditions at 74 Baring Road it is necessary to control the glazing to be fitted within the side dormer extension.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given, I find 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, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

*John D Allan*

INSPECTOR