

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2019

**by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 27 February 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/18/3213583**

**Flat 6, Viewpoint, 7 Sandbourne Road, Bournemouth BH4 8JP**

- 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 Nigel O'Driscoll against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application, Ref. 7-2018-4407-V, dated 27 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2018.
  - The development proposed is a replacement patio door.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement patio door at Flat 6, Sandbourne Road, Bournemouth in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 7-2018-4407-V, dated 27 March 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 shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved details: OS based Location & Site Plan; Amended Smart Architectural Aluminium Drawing: 'External View' plus dimensions and annotations; Computer Graphic Illustration (CGI) showing superimposed proposed doors – photo 4;
  - 3) The replacement doors shall be constructed with the main frame in white finished aluminium replicating the existing patio doors, and the intermediate hinged folding mullions finished in grey.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Viewpoint and its immediate surroundings.

### Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the elevation of the block that includes the patio door to Flat 6 has four main sections separated by brick piers extending the full height of the building. The fenestration is handed between adjoining sections and because it is of the same scale and design it achieves a pleasing balance and symmetry that defines much of the architectural integrity of the building.
-

4. There are some variations between the appearances of the flats in the form of the thickness and materials used for the frames of the patio doors, but because these are of the same design they do not result in significant differences in the appearance of the building's elevation as a whole. The variations that do occur are more to do with internal blinds that are outside planning control and balconies' balustrades and their outdoor 'furniture'. The officer's report says that the existing patio doors at Flat 6 are of a different design but this is denied by the appellant. And from my own inspection, albeit from the distance of a position on the lawn outside, they do in fact appear to be original.
5. Be that as it may, I consider that the Council is correct to adopt a strict approach to proposed replacement doors and windows in order to safeguard the appearance of the building. However, with the building now of some age there are likely to be more applications to upgrade the glazing in line with the considerable technological advances that have occurred since Viewpoint was built.
6. In this case the appellant has explained the reasons for replacement, including ease of use and improved insulation. The two additional mullions, essentially the only potentially noticeable difference in the appearance of the doors, would be grey as opposed to white, which would reduce their prominence. Furthermore, through the submitted CGI it has been demonstrated that when seen from outside there would be no discernible difference in appearance between the existing doors partially opened and the proposed bi-folding doors.
7. With all things considered I conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the balance and symmetry of the fenestration in this elevation of the building. Because of the need to maintain these qualities in the appearance of Viewpoint, my decision is finely balanced, but I have formed the view that the replacement doors would fall just on the side of allowing their installation.
8. In reaching this decision I have had regard to the letters of objection. However, the Council appears to accept the appellant's view that a substantial amount of opposition to the scheme was to the error in the application that the proposed overall width would be 4m rather than the existing 3m. This has now been corrected through the submission of the amended plan.
9. For the reasons explained, I find that the proposal would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of Viewpoint and its immediate surroundings. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012 or Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.
10. I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and details is needed for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition specifying the materials will similarly ensure that the replacement doors actually have the appearance as specified in the application and the grounds of appeal.

*Martin Andrews*

INSPECTOR