



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2021

by James Blackwell LLB (Hons) PgDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/21/3285981

16 West Road, Bournemouth BH5 2AN

- 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 Charles Garegnani & Mrs Anita Garegnani against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-27008-A, dated 17 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations and two storey rear and side extension. Add new dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 18 West Road.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located in a built-up area of Bournemouth. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, and comprises a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings. Whilst these do vary in terms of design and style, most properties generally incorporate pitched or hipped roofs, which adds a degree of consistency to the prevailing roofscape. Whilst there are examples of rooflights on the roofs of nearby neighbouring dwellings, there is no notable prevalence of roof dormers in the locality.
4. The proposed development would introduce a dormer window along the north-western roof pitch of the appeal dwelling. Whilst relatively modest in width, the dormer would incorporate a flat roof and would sit very close to the ridge of the main roof. This would directly contravene the guidance set out in the Council's Extensions SPD¹, which is explicit that flat roof dormers should be avoided. The guidance also states that where dormers are proposed, they should be set "*well below the ridge line*". Owing to the conflicts with this guidance, the proposed

¹ Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (September 2008)

dormer would fail to appear properly subservient to the main roof pitch, and would instead appear as a bulky addition to the roof. The bulk of the dormer would be especially prominent, due to the absence of other dormers in the vicinity of the appeal property. As a result, it would appear as an incongruous feature of the prevailing roofscape, thereby harming the appearance of the host property and the wider area.

5. For these reasons, the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of both the appeal dwelling and the wider area. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (adopted 2012) (Local Plan), which seeks to ensure new development achieves high quality design which responds properly to the characteristics of the site and its immediate surroundings. For the reasons set out above, the development would also conflict with the guidance set out in the Council's Extensions SPD. Finally, the development would conflict with the overarching design objectives of the Framework (2021).

Living Conditions

6. Number 18 West Road is situated to the south-east of the appeal property. Whilst the front entrance to no. 18 is along West Road, its principal frontage faces out on to Stourfield Road which runs north-east off West Road. Due to this orientation, the southern side elevation of the appeal property runs parallel with the rear garden to no. 18, extending across the majority of the width of its rear boundary. Given the modest size of the rear garden to no. 18, this already creates a sense of enclosure to the rear of no. 18.
7. Nonetheless, due to the stepped design of the existing side elevation to the appeal property, there is currently an intervening gap between the appeal dwelling and the rear boundary to no. 18. Whilst this gap is modest, it helps ensure that the existing sense of enclosure already experienced to the rear of no. 18 is not unduly oppressive or overbearing.
8. The proposed extension would bring the side elevation of the appeal dwelling approximately 1.5 metres closer to the rear boundary of no. 18, significantly reducing the intervening gap between the two properties. Given the existing sense of enclosure already experienced to the rear of no. 18, the loss of this intervening gap would be felt acutely by its occupiers. It would exacerbate the current sense of enclosure already experienced, thereby creating an oppressive and overbearing relationship between the appeal property and no. 18.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 18 West Road. The development would therefore conflict with Policy CS41 of the Local Plan, which requires new development to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Similarly, the development would conflict with guidance set out in the Council's Extensions SPD, which seeks to safeguard neighbouring amenity, specifically in terms of overlooking, overshadowing and overbearing or oppressive impact. Finally, the development would conflict with the overarching objectives of the Framework (2021), which again seeks to adequately protect the interests of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

10. Whilst I acknowledge that properties are built closely together in the area, the appeal property occupies a relatively unique position, as it sits between two

separate roads which run off West Road. Due to this siting, the garden to no. 18 is already significantly more constrained than other gardens in the immediate vicinity, due to its close proximity to the appeal dwelling. Unfortunately, this means there is less scope to accommodate an extension to no. 16 in the location proposed.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR