



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/18/3212538

31 Horsham Avenue, Bournemouth BH10 7JB

- 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 Messrs MHH Poole Limited against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2018-12452-E, dated 21 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing single storey extension and erect a two bedroom semi-detached house with parking. Block up window at first floor side / North East elevation. Alterations to internal layout of existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The housing in Horsham Avenue is predominantly semi-detached but there are also a small number of detached dwellings. The appeal property lies in the former category; it is prominently situated at the corner of Horsham Avenue and Glendon Avenue. The original dwelling was set back from the minor road, reflecting 33 Horsham Avenue opposite, but a single-storey flat roof extension now takes up much of the side garden.
4. The proposal is to replace the extension with a two-storey structure which would become a separate dwelling. I saw examples elsewhere within the street of detached houses on corner plots having been extended to provide additional dwellings. In each case, the resultant building is of equivalent scale and form to a pair of semi-detached properties, the likes of which characterise the street.
5. The appeal scheme would create a terrace of three dwellings, with the new unit being narrower than the others. This form of development would be materially different to the developments at Nos 56 and 96 Horsham Avenue, both of which are semi-detached but could easily be mistaken for detached dwellings. The new terrace would be visually incongruous and at odds with the prevailing pattern of detached and homogeneous semi-detached homes.

6. The relationship of the proposed two-storey building to Glendon Avenue would be not unlike that which already exists between 56 Horsham Avenue and Russel Road. The extension to No 56 was allowed on appeal, but neither party has provided a copy of the Inspector's decision letter. Although I do not know the reasons for that development being approved, the buildings around this crossroads are noticeably tighter to the road in comparison to those flanking the entrance to Glendon Avenue.
7. Notwithstanding the proposal to provide a narrow buffer strip between the building and the pavement, the appeal scheme would reduce the sense of openness stemming from the two-storey buildings being set back either side of the junction. It would stand out as discordant form of development and would harm the street scenes of both adjoining roads.
8. I have taken into consideration the fact that a bungalow has been constructed to the rear of No 31. I have also noted the various other plot subdivisions, mostly involving new bungalows on backland plots, which have taken place in the northern half of Horsham Avenue. However, none of these developments alter my overall conclusion that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. Accordingly, I find that there would be conflict with Policies CS6, CS20, CS21 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (CS) and Policy 6.8 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan (2002). These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it requires development to be sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

10. There is no dispute that this is a highly sustainable location for new housing. Residents of the proposed dwelling would live within easy walking and cycling distance of a supermarket and a range of other services and facilities. Furthermore, it is evident from other developments in the locality that the Council is not averse to urban intensification. The proposal would deliver a small family dwelling in line with the objectives of CS Policy CS20. These material considerations count in favour of the appeal scheme, but they do not outweigh the harm I have identified or the conflict with the development plan taken as a whole.
11. The Council has advised that a financial contribution is required towards Strategic Access Monitoring and Management, to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development on the Dorset Heathlands European sites. Although the appellant has confirmed a willingness to make this contribution, I have not been provided with a planning obligation. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons the lack of a planning obligation would not lead me to a different decision.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR