

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2019

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3240548

18 The Broadway, Southbourne, Bournemouth BH6 4HF

- 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 Richard Kendrick against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application, Ref. 7-2019-21332-B dated 26 July 2019 was refused by notice dated 20 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a one and a half storey side extension with pitched roof to form garage and ensuite bathroom.
-

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 host dwelling and the street scene of The Broadway.

Reasons

3. The appearance of the existing house is one where the prominent asymmetry of the cat-slide roof at the front is pleasingly balanced by the fully hipped roof of the flank elevation. The appeal proposal, through the introduction of a further cat-slide roof running parallel to the existing, would effectively result in the whole dwelling having an asymmetric appearance in the street scene. The contrast in architectural style and overall appearance between the extended building and the three neighbouring dwellings would be so pronounced that No. 18 would almost certainly draw the eye as being harmfully out of keeping.
 4. I acknowledge that The Broadway is a residential road with a large variety of dwelling types, designs and sizes. I have also noted the comments in the grounds of appeal that some of the area's character is derived from the formal grid of the road pattern and the screening effect of mature trees. Because of these factors, and notwithstanding that I share the Council's reservations as to the design, there could be a case for justifying the appeal scheme if No. 18 was on a plot with ample space to the side boundaries.
 5. However, the proposal uses all of the existing space to the boundary with No. 16 in a situation where that building is already tight to its boundary. Even allowing for the single storey height of the side wall of the proposed garage, the
-

cramped relationship between two dwellings of a markedly different appearance in my view supports the Council's reasons for refusing permission.

6. The grounds of appeal have drawn my attention that a short distance along The Broadway there has been the erosion of gaps between dwellings as a result of extensions. With the exception of No. 87, I do not know the circumstances of these developments but I accept that they have had a harmful impact on the quality of the street scene. However, in my view this does not justify a further development that would also look out of place. With regard to No. 87, the scheme has totally remodelled the original building and whilst I understand the points being made, there are clear differences of design approach and site context that limit the extent to which it can be compared with this appeal.
7. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the existing building and street scene and would not comply with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012; the Council's 2008 residential extensions design guide and Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019. The latter is up to date and although the Council documents are now of some vintage I am not of the view that this has diminished their relevance or validity insofar as the appeal scheme is concerned.
8. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR