



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 7th October 2019.

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3229621

17A The Bungalow, Queens Park Gardens, Bournemouth BH8 9BN

- 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 & Mrs Suthers against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-12379-D, dated 13 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Queens Park Gardens is a residential street with a variety of dwelling types. The majority are two storey detached properties of traditional appearance. Many properties have been altered, but the overall form and character of the dwellings remains largely unchanged. The appeal property is one of a row of three detached bungalows in the street. Although all three originally had pyramidal roofs, 17 Queens Park Gardens has recently been extended to form gable ends either side, with a box dormer and single storey extension to the rear.
4. The proposed extension would take the form of a timber clad box sited partly on the flat roof of the existing rear extension and partly intersecting with the main roof. The combination of the pyramidal roof and the proposed rectangular extension would result in an awkward and jarring juxtaposition as the two shapes would have no relationship to one another. The siting of the proposed extension wrapping around two planes of the main roof would unbalance the roof and detract from the appearance of the host property. Accordingly, while it would be lower than the ridge and set in from the eaves, the proposed extension would not appear subservient or complementary to the host property.
5. Although the extension would be set well back from the front of the property, it would be clearly visible from the street through the gap between the host property and 17B Queens Park Gardens. As such it would be a prominent and

discordant feature in the street scene. The proposed extension would also be glimpsed in gaps between properties in Richmond Park Crescent to the rear, and would be seen from the rear gardens of neighbouring dwellings. From these vantage points the contrast between the form and window style of the proposed extension and the host property would be obvious and further add to the harm to the character and appearance of the host property.

6. The use of vertical timber cladding in this elevated and exposed position would contrast strongly with the tiled roof of the host property. It would draw the eye to the proposed extension and as such, exacerbate its impact. While no detail of the type of cladding is specified, the plans indicate a natural hue and the appellant confirms that it would be of good quality. Given its size and position, the impact of the extension would not be materially reduced if a different colour or type of cladding were to be used. As such the harm that I have identified could not be satisfactorily mitigated through an appropriately worded planning condition.
7. While I appreciate that the extension is deliberately designed to be a distinct and contemporary feature, it would not respect or fit in with the overall form of the host property or its surroundings. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would conflict with policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 which requires, amongst other things, that development is well designed and of a high quality.
8. Furthermore, it would conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that development is visually attractive and adds to the overall quality of the area. The appeal scheme would not be an outstanding or innovative design which promotes high levels of sustainability or helps raise the standard of design in the area. As such it would not be justified by paragraph 131 of the Framework.
9. The proposal would not accord with guidance for roof extensions in the Council's document 'Residential extensions: A design guide for householders' (2008), albeit that I have only afforded it limited weight given that, although adopted, as the appellant points out it does not appear to have the status of a Supplementary Planning Document.
10. Although it is not in a conservation area or other designated area, nonetheless local and national policy still requires development to achieve high quality design, which the appeal proposal would not accomplish.

Other matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to a previously approved scheme to extend the ridge of the host property to the rear following the line of the roof, which includes vertical timber cladding on the side and rear. While the approved scheme includes some contemporary elements, it would have a much closer relationship to the form and appearance of the host property than the proposed development. Furthermore, with the approved scheme the timber cladding would be partially screened by the existing roof so would not be a prominent feature. As such, although taller than the appeal proposal, the approved scheme would not have the same impact on the character and

appearance of the host property or the surrounding area as the development now proposed.

12. The adjacent property No 17 has what appears to be coloured composite cladding on the gable ends, rear dormer and rear extension. Only the gable ends are visible from the street, where the cladding is used in a traditional way which complements the extended form of the dwelling. It is not therefore comparable to the case before me, which I have considered on its own merits.

Conclusion

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

L McKay

INSPECTOR