



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

**by Andrew Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

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

**Decision date: 14 November 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/19/3225298**

**11 Dalmeny Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH6 4BN**

- 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 David Shelton against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2018-4215-F, dated 12 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as 'extend rear roof to form gable front to match rear gable and to mirror frontages of new buildings No 9 and No 7. Extend side dormer to SE roof plane to give more balanced design. High level CG skylight to NW roof plane, similar to those in No 9. All to provide increased 1<sup>st</sup> floor accommodation.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. On 1 April 2019 Bournemouth Borough Council merged with Borough of Poole Council and Christchurch Borough Council to become Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. The development plans for the merged local planning authority remain in place for the former area of Bournemouth Borough Council until such a time as they are revoked or replaced. It is therefore necessary to determine this appeal with reference to policies set out in the plans produced by the now dissolved Bournemouth Borough Council.

### Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a bungalow that occupies a prominent corner position. It stands in a residential area that is characterised mainly by detached properties dating from the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The two neighbouring plots to the north of the appeal site have recently been redeveloped into two storey dwellings, albeit with a low eaves level over the first-floor accommodation. It is understood that these dwellings were previously of a similar design to the appeal property.
5. The appeal property has a broadly L shaped plan and as a result its roof is split into two parts. A narrow portion extends out towards Dalmeny Road to the east. A wider section of roof with a higher ridge line sits behind this with a large dormer extension that faces the road to the south. Owing to its large size and the fact that it occupies most of the roof area the existing dormer has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal would see the ridge of the larger portion of roof extended further east to form a gable with a small bonnet hip. I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. It would not be over-scaled alongside the redeveloped plots to the north.
7. In addition to this the south facing dormer would be extended. I note that the proposal was amended to reduce the size of the dormer extension and reduce the size of the additional window. However, even as amended, the extended dormer would have a broad scale and would be much larger than the existing dormer, which I have already found to be harmful. It would also occupy a significant area of the extended south facing roof, with a larger area of solid wall than the existing dormer, which would exacerbate its bulky scale. The Council's design guide<sup>1</sup> advises that flat roofed dormers with a horizontal emphasis should be avoided. The extended dormer would fail to be a subservient addition to the dwelling and would instead dominate its prominent south facing elevation and appear visually heavy. The lack of objection from local residents does not cause me to come to a different view.
8. At my visit to the area I saw lots of other examples of dormers. Most are well integrated with the design of the building and not overly dominant. The two dormers on the property opposite the appeal site, No 15 Dalmeny Road, are much smaller than the appeal proposal and sit on a larger roof plane, to the extent that they do not appear over-scaled or unduly dominant.
9. I accept that the redevelopment of the two plots to the north has increased the scale of built form in the context of the appeal site. The replacement buildings are larger than the existing bungalow at the appeal site, and they occupy a large footprint. However, both of these new dwellings have a simple roof form that is set down over the first-floor accommodation, with rooflights and a modest gable projection to the front. I am not satisfied that the increased scale of the proposed dormer should be considered more favourably owing to the recent redevelopment of these plots.
10. The appellant has referred to further revisions to the design that he would be willing to consider and a previous permission that was approved to increase the size of the existing window. However, I must consider the proposal on its own merits and solely on the basis of the plans upon which the Council based its decision.
11. In summary, the proposed dormer extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area, which would not accord with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted 2012, which seeks to ensure that development proposals are designed to a high quality to respect the site and its surroundings.

## **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

*Andrew Tucker*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Residential Extensions a Design Guide for Householders 2008