



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3242039

116 Wick Lane, Bournemouth BH6 4LT

- 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 and Mrs Wright against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-8609-G, dated 26 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is extensions to front and rear, new roof over new and existing with accommodation therein.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extensions to bungalow to include formation of first floor level with balconies and rooflights at 116 Wick Lane, Bournemouth, BH6 4LT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2019-8609-G, dated 26 July 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 019/019/03, 019/019/02, 019/019/01E and 019/019/04.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Wright against Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. In the interests of clarity, and as I consider it best describes the proposal before me, I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form rather than that found on the original application form. These documents describe the development as alterations and extensions to bungalow to include formation of first floor level with balconies and rooflights.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
- the effect of the development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property, 116 Wick Lane, is a bungalow which occupies a substantial corner plot. The bungalow is set back from the road and largely screened from view by mature planting and the property's garage.
6. Wick Lane is characterised by a variety of housing types; some properties are 1.5 storey, some 2 storey and some single storey. The design of buildings in the area is also diverse with different building types and heights sited next to each other. For example, the neighbouring dwelling at 118 Wick Lane, whilst currently single storey, has a different character and appearance to the appeal property and, furthermore, has planning permission to raise the roof and add a new room in the roof with a balcony.
7. The proposal is to enlarge and reconfigure the existing dwelling substantially by extending the front elevation and altering the rear conservatory at ground floor level and, more significantly, raising the roof of the bungalow to create first floor habitable accommodation.
8. The proposal would undoubtedly dramatically alter the scale and proportions of the host dwelling and the altered building would indeed step away from the restrained form and scale of the original building. The dwelling would be a more substantial property, two storey in appearance, with a large amount of glazing and a distinctly more contemporary design.
9. Nevertheless, as discussed above, the variety of buildings within the area, including in respect of roof forms, heights and sizes, is such that the dwelling, as altered, would not appear incongruous or out of keeping with others in the area. In my view no single style is dominant along Wick Lane.
10. The roof profile of the dwelling would also be altered by the scheme. However, in my view the proposed roof alterations would be proportionate to the dwelling as extended and would not appear as an unduly dominant or disproportionate feature.
11. Whilst I appreciate that the altered dwelling would be large, in my view, the plot is capable of accommodating a dwelling of this size and the scale of the property would be in keeping with the property's prominent location on a corner plot which emphasises the visual "end" to the road as it turns a sharp corner.
12. Though the dwelling would be markedly different in appearance and would not be the same as others around it, it would reflect key design elements, such as the gables, and use complementary materials in order to ensure it would not look out of place within the street scene. The verdant character of the area

would also soften the appearance of the dwelling when viewed from a number of vantage points along Wick Lane.

13. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposal would accord with policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted October 2012 (CS). Amongst other things this policy seeks to ensure that all development and spaces are well designed and of a high quality and states that development should, through its scale, density, layout, siting, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings.
14. I acknowledge that elements of the proposal would not be consistent with guidance contained within the Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders Supplementary Planning Document, September 2008 (SPG). The SPG advises that the bulk and mass of an extension should be smaller than the existing building. However, the SPG is guidance and I consider that the proposal would not conflict with its aim of preventing bulky additions which dominate and, consequently, adversely affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Living conditions

15. In addition to raising the roof height of the building the proposal would also introduce a number of new high level windows in the rear elevation of the altered dwelling. The windows would face the side elevation and shallow rear garden area of No 114 Wick Lane and the rear elevation and garden of No 3 Rosecrea Avenue.
16. However, the proposed windows would be velux windows within the roof slope and the window cills would be approximately 2m (in the Master bedroom) and 1.9m (in the second bedroom) above the finished floor level. At this height, these windows would not offer direct views into the gardens and rear windows of the neighbouring properties. I acknowledge that the existence of windows in this elevation may increase the perception that neighbouring properties are being overlooked. However, some degree of overlooking is common in residential environments and the perceived overlooking would not be such so as to cause undue harm to the living conditions at those properties.
17. The increased roof height, bulk and profile of the altered dwelling would indeed form a higher profile structure in the outlook from both No 114 Wick Lane and No 3 Rosecrea Avenue. I also acknowledge that the backdrop for those properties would be further altered should the planning permission at No 118 Wick Lane be implemented.
18. However, due to the angle of the existing dwelling at No 116, its position in relation to No 3 Rosecrea Avenue and the separation distance between the properties, the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of that property would be minimal. Similarly, the position of the property at No 116 is such that it would continue to angle away from the neighbouring property at No 114.
19. In my view, the pattern of development is already one where properties are quite tightly knit and are, consequently, close to and visible from neighbouring dwellings. Whilst the dwelling as altered would be larger and therefore would be more pronounced when viewed from No 114 Wick Lane and No 3 Rosecrea Avenue, this would not be so different from the current arrangement so as to

cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of those properties.

20. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy and outlook. Therefore, the proposal would be consistent with policy CS41 of the CS. Amongst other things this policy seeks to ensure that all development and spaces provide a high standard of amenity to meet the day to day requirements of future occupants and seeks to ensure that new developments enhance the amenity of future occupiers. In this instance, the amenity standards for the occupiers of the appeal property would be enhanced by the proposal and those of neighbouring residents would not be unduly harmed.
21. I acknowledge that elements of the proposal would, once again, fail to accord with the SPG. The SPG states that a minimum distance of 21m should be maintained back to back between rear facing windows on parallel buildings. The separation distance between the proposal and the dwelling at No 3 Rosecrea Drive would fall short of this standard at approximately 17m. However, the appeal property is sited at an angle to No 3 and, for the reasons set out above, I consider the underlying aim of the SPG to ensure proposals do not have an adverse effect on the living conditions at neighbouring properties would be met.

Conditions

22. In addition to the standard commencement condition, one that requires the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition which requires the external surfaces to match those of the existing building is necessary in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the proposed development.

Conclusion

23. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issues, I conclude that the appeal proposal is acceptable and would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area or adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to privacy and outlook. The appeal therefore succeeds.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR