
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 February 2021

by **L McKay MA MRTPI**

Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/20/3256389

26 Romney Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH10 6JR

- 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 Mrs R Singh against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2020-27695, dated 9 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side, single storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling and new roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to side, single storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling and new roof at 26 Romney Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH10 6JR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2020-27695, dated 9 March 2020 and the plans submitted with it, 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: 100/0220, 103/0220, 104/0220.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Romney Road comprises mainly detached dwellings which, despite varying designs, generally share features such as bay windows, hipped roofs and overhanging eaves which create articulation and rhythm in the street scene. Various extensions to the existing dwelling, including a flat roofed front projection, give it a somewhat disjointed appearance and make it an anomaly in the street scene, detracting from the appearance of the area.
4. The proposed side extension would not be set back from the front wall as the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide recommends, and due to its

width and scale would not appear subservient to the existing dwelling. However, the front wall of the dwelling is already stepped because of the previous front extension. Therefore, even with the proposed extension the front elevation would retain a reasonable degree of articulation. This would be reinforced by the proposed enlargement of the roof to create a deep eaves overhang over the set-back section, which would effectively become the subservient part of the dwelling. In these circumstances, the lack of subservience of the proposed side extension does not warrant refusal.

5. The proposal would also incorporate the existing extensions under a larger hipped roof, comparable with the height and pitch of neighbouring roofs, which would give the dwelling a more coherent appearance than at present. As a result of this roof alteration, although relatively large the proposed side extension would not appear out of proportion with the dwelling as a whole. By incorporating some of the characteristic features of the street scene and integrating the existing extensions, I find that overall, the proposal would improve the appearance of the dwelling.
6. The Design Guide also recommends at least 1m off-set from side boundaries, which the proposal would not achieve. However, the staggered boundary with No 28 would maintain a small gap between the proposed extension and that dwelling, and the larger gap to No 24 would remain unchanged. Gaps between properties in this road vary considerably, with a number of dwellings occupying much of the width of their plots and extending close to the neighbours on at least one side. In this context, the proposal would not appear cramped or out of keeping with the local pattern of development.
7. The proposed rear extension would be screened from view from the road, and due to its limited height and depth would not appear visually intrusive when seen from neighbouring properties. As such, it would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. Accordingly, by improving the appearance of the existing dwelling the proposal would slightly enhance the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would comply with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy, which seeks to ensure that development respects the site and its surroundings and enhances local character. It would also comply with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

9. A condition is necessary to require compliance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. The application form specifies that materials to match the existing dwelling would be used, which would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR