



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2020

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/20/3251425

5 Longbarrow Close, Bournemouth, BH8 9LL

- 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 P Merrick against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-22775-C, dated 5 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is extend roof, construct dormer and convert roof-space to habitable accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is the variation of a scheme granted planning permission by the Council, (Council Ref: 7-2019-22775-B). The only difference is the approved development added a dormer to the front hipped roof slope whereas the appeal scheme proposes extending the ridge forward to form a front gable feature above a small retained part of the front hipped roof slope. The decision therefore focusses on this aspect of the appeal scheme.
4. Longbarrow Close contains a two storey building on either side of the entrance to the street and then seven bungalows, including the appeal property. All the properties in the street have a hipped and tiled main roof. The detached garages in the street likewise have a hipped and tiled roof. The hipped and tiled roof form is therefore a distinctive and important part of the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.
5. While three of the bungalows have gable ended front projections, including No 6 which is adjacent to the appeal property, these are subsidiary elements with a ridge lower than the main roof. The small gable feature which breaks the eaves line of the eastern two storey building at the entrance to the close is similarly a subsidiary element. Consequently, the distinctive main hipped roof form remains the predominant roof form.

6. Due to its scale and position, the proposed gable feature would prominently dominate the front roof of the appeal property, and so the important hipped form of the locality would be harmfully eroded. Although the triangular shaped silhouette of the front roof would be retained in public views of the site, the discordant nature of the gable feature would be apparent and emphasised by the proposed weatherboard cladding. It would therefore be an unsympathetic addition to the host property and appear incongruous within the street scene.
7. The Council's 2008 'Residential extensions, a design guide for householders' notes that changing a pitched roof to a gable can only be successfully achieved in certain locations. While the supporting diagram of an unsuitable scheme shows a straight row of properties where the gable is combined with a raised ridge, it is for illustrative purposes and not intended to be definitive. Owing to the distinctive pitched main roof form found in Longbarrow Close, which is continuous albeit in a staggered arc wrapping around the close, the appeal site is not a location where changing to a dominant front gable feature can be successfully achieved. Although the appellants have drawn attention to properties with front facing gables found elsewhere in the neighbourhood, these are in different streets with different contexts.
8. In light of the above, it is concluded the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It would conflict with Policy CS41 of the 2012 Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy which seeks to ensure all development represents high quality design that respects the site and its surroundings. It would further conflict with the Council's design guide, referred to above, which sets out that proposals should maintain or enhance the character of the existing house and its setting. It would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

PLANNING DECISION OFFICER