The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2019

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPl MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/19/3226287
15 Hastings Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH8 0HN

- 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 Shaun Critchley against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council, now Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
- The application Ref 7-2018-23552-B, dated 3 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2019.
- The development proposed is for a rear and side first floor extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions of the occupants of 13 Hastings Road, with specific reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a residential street comprising a mix of dwelling types and designs. 15 Hastings Road has a single garage attached to its western side which largely fills the void between the host dwelling and 13 Hastings Road.

4. No 15 has already been extended in a number of ways and includes a hip-to-gable extension, as well as a sizeable box dormer to its rear roof slope. The dwelling also has a deep single storey rear extension which fills the width of the plot. The proposed extension would be built in part over this latter element, as well as the garage and would accentuate further the built form on site, the original form and scale of which has already been subsumed by development.

5. I accept that use of a non-standard design solution does not render a proposal as unacceptable in principle, however in assessing the impact of extensions on dwellings, one has to take into account those that have preceded it, including the cumulative effect upon the character and appearance of the host. The proposal would give rise to an erosion to the existing aforementioned gap between nos 13 and 15, and by virtue of its squat ridgeline and rather unusual architecture, would render it as incongruous addition within the street scene,

notwithstanding its set back from the principal elevation. Overall I consider that the proposed extension would appear contrived and ultimately would give rise to an overdevelopment of the subject dwelling.

6. I accept that the Council's Extension Guidelines document suggests that a 1m set back of a front wall and a step in to the side is acceptable. However, other factors are at play here, and simply because a proposal complies with these guidelines in a numerical sense does not automatically render a proposal as aesthetically acceptable.

7. I therefore consider that the proposed extension by reason of its design and siting would result in an overdevelopment of the host dwelling giving rise to harm to its character and appearance, as well as that of the street scene. In this respect I find that the proposal is contrary to Policy CS41 of the Adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) which seeks to ensure that all development and spaces are well designed and of high quality; and that it should, through its scale, layout, siting and character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings.

Living Conditions

8. The boundary to the rear garden shared with no 13 is demarcated by a high close boarded fence and shrubbery within the neighbouring garden. The proposal would bring two storey built form closer to this neighbouring property, although as identified on one of the submitted drawings, the extension would not fall foul of a 45° line from the centre point of the closest windows. By virtue of the limited height of the extension and the shallow projection beyond the original rear two storey elevation I consider, on balance, that the outlook from no 13 would not be unduly harmed.

9. However, this factor in favour of the scheme, does not outweigh the harm that the proposal would have upon the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR