
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by L Crouch BA (Hons) MSc IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3236897

46 Newstead Road, Bournemouth BH6 3HL

- 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 Cliff Lay against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-21688-C, dated 27 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'alterations and additions to include ground floor rear extension, modifications to loft conversion including rear terrace and extended dormer window and remodelling the facades'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey well-proportioned rendered dwelling, with a two storey angled bay window to the left of the front door and a square two storey bay window above the front door. No 46 Newstead Road has a simple hipped roof and hipped side gable, which lie in close proximity to the neighbouring boundary of No 48 Newstead Road.
4. The houses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are mainly characterised by well-proportioned two storey detached dwellings set within spacious plots. There is a larger flatted development across the road, which is of a greater scale, and as such appears in contrast to the surrounding smaller, two storey detached dwellings.
5. The generally orderly appearance gives a pleasing rhythm to the immediate street scene, enhanced by the set-back building line and the variety of gaps between buildings. This gives an overall spacious character to the immediate area. The houses in the general vicinity have a subtle variety of architectural designs, bay window designs and roof forms, although the predominant roof design is hipped. Where alterations have taken place to the roofs within the immediate area it is generally been achieved sensitively and modestly and generally of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the roof.

6. The roof alterations would be formed of two dormers connected by a flat roof which would wrap around the two separate roof planes on which the dormers would be installed. Whilst the wrapped element would not be overly evident from the street scene the dormer would be visible from the rear of the site, from within neighbouring gardens. This is contrary to guidance set out within the Bournemouth Borough Council's Design Guide for Householders Residential Extensions adopted 2008 (Design Guide), which advises against wrap around dormers, flat roofed dormers and dormers with a horizontal emphasis.
7. The side dormer, despite not protruding beyond the eaves of the roof and being stepped back from the wall forming the side elevation, would by virtue of its length, no windows and elongated flat roof, result in a visually blank elevation and dominant addition to the roof slope, which would appear unattractive and obtrusive.
8. Although the existing chimney stack would be positioned in front of the dormer it would not be successful at fully screening the dormer due to its proposed large scale and flat roof form. This would result in a visible, incongruous addition in the immediate street scene, where dormers of such scale and design are not common.
9. The appeal property has a variety of bay window designs including square, angled and circular. In the immediate area there is a predominance of angled bay windows, although there are also a few examples of circular and square gable forms. The angled form gives a recessive appearance to the frontage. The appellant wishes to replace the bay window to the left of the front door, which I saw on my site visit is a circular bay window on the ground floor and an angled bay window to the first floor, with a square bay window. The square form, over two storeys, incorporating large areas of glazing, would appear starkly prominent and harmful to the appeal site and at odds with the surrounding area.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012. This policy seeks amongst other things to ensure high quality design, which respects or enhances the character and appearance of the area and has appropriate materials, scale and massing to the property and its surroundings.
11. The proposal is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), which places a clear emphasis on achieving well designed places and good design.

Other Matters

12. Other examples have been brought to my attention by the appellant of various forms of dormers, roof additions and bay windows in the area. I was also able to see examples of these on my site visit. However, many of the examples provided are generally not within the immediate vicinity of the site and are set within a different context and character to the appeal site. As such these examples do not appear to represent a direct comparison with the appeal site. Additionally, I do not have all the details of what led to these developments being built. In any event, I must assess the case before me on its own merits and their existence does not justify the harm I have found.

13. The appellant states that the Design Guide pre-dates the Framework by 4 years and therefore should be given limited weight. Whilst I note that the Design Guide predates the Framework, the document contains strong principles of quality design and does not contradict the Framework's focus on enhancing the local area and emphasis on good design. As such, I find it relevant to the appeal and I give it significant weight.

Conclusion

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

L Crouch

INSPECTOR