
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: 20 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3233928
53 East Avenue, Bournemouth BH3 7BT

- 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 A Mitchell against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-7433-H, dated 20 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to dwellinghouse, including dormer to side.
-

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. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial detached dwelling built in the 1920s. It is typical of dwellings in the area, which are set in large plots, set back from a wide road that is lined with mature trees.
5. The Meyrick Park and Talbot Woods Conservation Area Appraisal 2009 (CAA) recognises that interwar properties represent the greatest period of development within the CA area, and those built in the 1920s are almost all based on the picturesque vernacular style influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. This is the case for the existing dwelling, which is recognised in the CAA as a good example, and contributes positively to the character of the CA. It has a prominent but simple hipped roof, with a long catslide slope at the

- western end. This is typical of roofs of 1920s buildings in the CA, which are generally hipped and often feature catslide roofs.
6. The appeal follows a series of approvals for alterations to the existing property. When compared with previous schemes the appeal proposal is for a simplified rear extension to which the Council does not object, and a first-floor side extension, which would give improved head height to two en-suites that formed part of a previous approval.
 7. The side extension would take the form of a large hipped roof extension that would sit on the previously approved catslide roof. It would introduce an additional form to the roof of the existing building that would have a narrow front facing roof plane and valley which would significantly detract from the simple appearance of the existing roof. It would be prominent to view from the road, particularly from the northeast where the existing hip can be easily viewed. Whilst I accept that it would be subservient to the existing dwelling, it would be an unsympathetic addition that would fail to respond positively to its simple character and form. It would thus fail to preserve the character or appearance of this part of the CA.
 8. During my visit to the area I saw examples of dwellings that had been extended to the side and took note of the examples referred to by the appellant, which mainly include conventional dormer additions and full side extensions that integrate well with the host dwelling. The front facing dormer windows at No 12 Elgin Road relate well to the form of the dwelling and do not detract from the simple hipped form of the roof. I accept that the proposal is similar to the side extension at No 44 East Avenue, which is close to the appeal site. However, this extension has a more conventional full two storey form than the appeal proposal, and as a result better integrates with the host dwelling. On this basis I find that the proposed roof extension, which would be neither a traditional dormer or a full two storey extension, is not characteristic of the 1920s dwellings in the CA.
 9. The appellants also refer to a new dwelling at No 49 Elgin Road. I accept that a new dwelling could have a greater effect on the character and appearance of the CA than an addition to an existing dwelling, however alterations to existing dwellings need to be carefully considered to ensure that the significance of the CA is preserved.
 10. The statutory duty set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The proposed roof extension has a negative effect on the significance of the CA, resulting in harm. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the harm is less than substantial, however permission should only be allowed if clear public benefits outweigh against this harm. When compared with the extant approvals the extended area of roof would improve head height in the already approved en-suites. This would be a small private benefit to the occupiers of the dwelling.
 11. In summary, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA, contrary to Saved Policy 4.4 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan 2002, Policies CS39 and CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy adopted 2012 and the Framework which together seek to ensure that development proposals are well designed and preserve or enhance the

character or appearance of a conservation area in a manner that would not cause harm to significance.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Tucker

INSPECTOR