



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: 05 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3284460

27 Pine Vale Crescent, Bournemouth BH10 6BG

- 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 Keith Gould of Asplan Associates Limited against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-21465-C, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as rear extension and rooms in new roof.
-

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 host property and the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 25 Pine Vale Crescent.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a modest bungalow with a hipped roof, and is situated on a residential street which is characterised by a tight grain of development. Whilst houses along the road are mixed, the appeal property sits among a collection of other bungalows and chalet bungalows which are broadly similar in size and design. Whilst some of these do incorporate roof dormers, their side elevations generally remain straight and linear, which gives the dwellings along this stretch of the road a degree of simplicity and coherence which contributes positively to the street scene.
4. The proposed development would extend the roof ridge by introducing gable ends at both front and rear. The alterations would also include a dormer with sloping roof pitch on the south-eastern roof pitch. On the same side, the development would include a two-storey side-gable feature, which would project out from the principal side elevation. The extension to the rear would incorporate a catslide roof and additional flat roofed dormer.
5. The combined visual impact of the side dormer and gable feature would noticeably disrupt the established linear pattern of development that

characterises this section of the street, and would therefore appear visually discordant with the closest neighbouring properties. Moreover, the side and rear dormers would each incorporate different roof designs, creating a distinct mismatch between the two which would jar with the simplistic design features of the main bulk of the dwelling. This mismatch would be further exacerbated by the rear catslide roof, which lacks any degree of coherence with the main roof. Due to the extent of these differing design features, the extensions and alterations would appear haphazard and incoherent, and would fail to assimilate properly with either the host property or its neighbouring dwellings.

6. As a result, the development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. The development would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (Local Plan), which seeks to ensure development achieves a high-quality design which responds properly to the prevailing character of the area in terms of scale, layout and appearance. The development would also conflict with guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extensions Design Guide¹ (Design Guide), which requires extensions and alterations to integrate properly with the host dwelling and neighbouring properties. Finally, the development would conflict with overarching design objectives of the Framework (2021).

Living Conditions

7. Although the proposed extension would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the appeal dwelling, the degree of projection beyond the rear line of no. 25 would only be slight. Moreover, the rear extension would be lower level than the main roof pitch and would incorporate a catslide roof, which would ensure that the projection beyond the rear building line of no. 25 would not feel unduly overbearing or oppressive.
8. On this basis, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no. 25. In this regard, the development would be consistent with Policy CS41 of the Local Plan, the Design Guide and the overarching provisions of the Framework (2021), all of which seek to ensure new development properly safeguards the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the changes to the roof design would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the appeal property, this would be broadly commensurate with the size and design of other neighbouring properties in the immediate vicinity of the appeal dwelling. As such, I do not consider that the increased bulk would in itself harm the character and appearance of the area. Nonetheless, this is a neutral factor and would not outweigh the harm arising from the visual discordance between the other alterations proposed.
10. The extension and alterations permitted under the fallback planning permission² relating to the appeal property, incorporated a design which was significantly more sympathetic and coherent to the host property than the development now proposed. As highlighted above, it is the visual discordance between the various alterations proposed that is the primary issue with the appeal application, rather than the additional bulk and mass. As such, this

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

² 7-2018-21465-A

earlier planning permission would not justify a grant of permission in this instance.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, it 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