
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2019

by James Taylor BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3234606
7 Horton Close, Bournemouth BH9 3PH

- 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 Ms Marie Moorcroft against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-27447, dated 20 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension at 7 Horton Close, Bournemouth BH9 3PH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2019-27447, dated 20 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 19 – NR/342/001, 19 – NR/342/002 A, and 19 – NR/342/003.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on i) the character and appearance of the area, and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 5 Horton Close with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. 7 Horton Close is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located within a suburban residential cul-de-sac. Within the street scene there is a variety of house types including detached, semi-detached and short terraces of housing. The street scene has a sense of space and openness due principally to the dwellings being set-back from the carriageway and the pockets of open space within the cul-de-sac and to the rear.
4. The host building has a high-degree of symmetry with the adjoining property despite its enclosed car port to the side. This is flush with the front elevation of the host building and extends up to the shared boundary with 5 Horton Close.

To the side of no 5 is a gated access to a driveway, leading to a recessed garage at the back of the plot.

5. The proposal would obviate the car port and replace it with a two-storey extension set-back from the front elevation of the host building. It would have a reduced ridge height. Due to the set-back and lower ridge, combined with the retention of the front elevation's brick pier, the proposal would appear as a subservient addition to the host building. The proposal would retain the articulation of the host building's frontage and a high degree of symmetry with the adjoining property. Furthermore, the use of matching materials would help it to assimilate with the existing.
6. The extension would be constructed up to the shared boundary and reduce the space between nos 5 and 7 at first-floor level. Therefore, the proposal would have technical conflict with the Council's adopted 'Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders' (design guide). This advises that side extensions ought to be set off the side boundary by at least a metre to avoid being cramped. Whilst I afford the document some weight, it is guidance and includes the caveat that each case should be assessed on its own merits.
7. Within the street scene there are examples of single-storey side extensions up to the shared boundary, including at the appeal site. Furthermore, I note the variety of the house types in the street includes short terraced rows which generate a tighter grain of development and variation in character. Additionally, the proposal would not affect the open gardens to the front of the housing or the public open spaces. These contribute more significantly to the sense of space in the street scene than the gaps between the dwellings. In this context, I consider that the subservience of the proposal to the host building avoids the creation of a cramped appearance.
8. From my site inspection I noted that the proposal would be visible at the rear within the open space. However, it would be seen in the context of a range of alterations and additions at the back of the houses, including fencing and outbuildings. Therefore, it would not appear incongruous.
9. In conclusion on the first main issue, for the reasons given above the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In this respect the proposal would accord with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy – Adopted October 2012 (BLPCS) which amongst other aims, seeks high quality design. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the objectives of the Council's design guide or the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

10. The proposal would extend the built form closer to no 5 than the existing at first-floor level. No 5's main private garden space is located immediately to the rear of the house. Here, occupiers of the property would continue to enjoy an open aspect at the rear, unaffected by the proposal. The most affected part of their property is in use as a driveway and making this area more enclosed is of little consequence. The side elevation of no 5 is blank save for an opening at first-floor level. This serves a bathroom, which is a non-habitable room.
11. Therefore, in conclusion on the second main issue, the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of no 5 with particular

regard to outlook. In this respect the proposal would accord with Policy CS41 of the BLPCS which amongst other aims, seeks high standards of living conditions for residents. Furthermore, I find no conflict with the objectives of the design guide or the Framework.

Conclusion and Conditions

12. I have had regard to the suggested conditions by the Council and impose the standard implementation condition and approved plans condition in order to define the terms of the permission. Furthermore, I consider that a condition to ensure matching external materials is necessary in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

James Taylor

INSPECTOR