



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2021

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3280961

1A Duncliff Road, Bournemouth, BH6 4LJ

- 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 M Blanchard against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-9988-E, dated 18 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations and roof extension to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and roof extension to dwelling at 1A Duncliff Road, Bournemouth, BH6 4LJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2021-9988-E, dated 18 February 2021, and the plans submitted with it, and subject to the conditions listed below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those on the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 21075

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the decision notices is slightly different to that on the application form, and I have adopted the former as it more accurately describes the appeal proposal.
3. On 20 July 2021 a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published. However, the policies that are relevant to this appeal have not changed and there was no need, therefore, to invite the parties to make further submissions in response to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the corner of Duncliff Road and Thornbury Road. The host property was formed from the rear part of a larger detached dwelling that now comprises two semi-detached bungalows. Whilst access to the appeal property is via Duncliff Road, as it forms the rear part of the pair, its principal elevation is onto Thornbury Road. The surrounding area comprises a mixture of similar bungalows interspersed with two storey detached properties. Combined, they form part of a modern estate where there is no uniform style, form or character.
6. As I also observed on my site visit, a number of properties in the area have converted their roofspace to habitable use with the benefit of dormer extensions or other forms of roof alterations. This includes 17 Thornbury Road, to the north west of the appeal site, a single storey bungalow with a large flat roofed dormer and balcony fronting the road. Also, 22 Thornbury Road, with a large flat roofed dormer on the side elevation facing Viking Way. Further examples of flat roofed dormers are to be found in the area.
7. The Council's 'Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders' (2008) (Design Guide) provides practice guidance to assist householders when seeking permission to extend or alter their properties. Paragraph 3.3 deals with 'Roof Alterations' and states that where dormer windows are proposed care needs to be taken to ensure that their size does not harm the character of the area, and that flat roofs should be avoided. It continues by stating that dormers should be set well below the ridge and up from the eaves of the existing roof, and that a dormer which extends from the eaves to the ridge is not considered good design and is likely to be rejected.
8. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a flat roofed dormer on the side (north) elevation of the host property facing 17 Thornbury Road. On the front (west) elevation, facing Thornbury Road, only the side profile (cheek) of the new dormer would largely be visible and it would be viewed in the context of the existing large gable end and main expanse of roof to the host property. The dormer would sit marginally below the ridge line to the main roof and just above the eaves. It would also be set back from the edge of the roof to the gable. The proposed dormer window would be proportional to those on the host property and the dormer would be constructed from cladding and tiling to match existing.
9. Whilst I accept that the proposed dormer would be large and includes a flat roof, it would not occupy an overly large area of this part of the roof plane, and the main expanse of roof to the host property, fronting Thornbury Road, would remain as existing. The siting of the proposed dormer on the side elevation would also assist in reducing its visual impact on the streetscene.
10. Although the Design Guide indicates that flat roof dormers should be avoided, it does not rule out this option and there is no local plan policy that seeks to prohibit this form of development. In some cases, flat roof dormers may provide the only design solution to extending existing roof accommodation and they are a form of development which, as in this case, can successfully be used to secure additional space at roof level.
11. Within the above context, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would be subservient and that, on balance, it would sit reasonably comfortably within the

roof plane of this part of the host property. It would not be an overly discordant or dominant feature and would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property or to its local context. That context includes the existing flat roofed dormers I referred to earlier, particularly at 17 Thornbury Road, which provides the immediate backdrop against which the proposed dormer would be viewed. As I indicated above, the local context and character is varied. There is no uniform built form or style, and a large number of properties have already been extended and altered at roof level.

12. I find, therefore, that whilst there would be conflict with the Design Guide, given the proposed design, local circumstances and context, this conflict would not be so significant as to justify the refusal of planning permission.
13. Accordingly, the appeal proposal would accord with policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) and the corresponding policies of the Framework.

Other Matters

14. Concerns have been raised by interested parties in relation to the issue of precedent, loss of amenity and the implications for permitted development rights. However, none of these are issues that have been raised by the Council in objecting to the appeal proposal and I am satisfied, based on the evidence before me, that they are not matters that would give rise to any material harm.

Conditions

15. The Council has suggested various conditions in their Questionnaire which I have considered against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. Conditions requiring compliance with the submitted plan and for materials to match existing are necessary and reasonable in order to reflect the details included within the application. I have, however, added a reference to the approved plan.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above and having taken all the matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G Roberts

INSPECTOR