



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by J Hills MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3304628
26, Eldon Road, BOURNEMOUTH BH9 2RT

- 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 Tom Baker against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2022-8635-C, dated 18 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is to form 4th bedroom over existing single garage, and erect porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form gives the applicant as Mr Mundy, who was the agent for the original application. It has subsequently been confirmed that this was an error, and that Mr Baker was intended to be the applicant. It is noted that Mr and Mrs Baker are cited on the application decision notice, and that the delegated officer report states them as the applicant. Therefore, I am satisfied a valid appeal has been made, and the name reflects the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is located within an established housing estate predominantly made up of street-fronted and detached properties, where hipped roofs are a prevailing characteristic. House types are varied but the street does include small groups of properties where there is some uniformity in design. Where there are frontage projections, these tend to be modest in scale.
5. The proportions and arrangement of the existing large, central window and two smaller windows either side on the front elevation are a strong design element and focal point to the host building. This particular design is also found in a nearby property. In terms of its siting, the building is set back from the road in line with neighbouring dwellings at a corner point in the estate, and it is this distinctive layout feature that makes a positive contribution towards the character and appearance of the immediate and surrounding area.

6. The extension would rise above an existing single garage which projects some considerable distance forward of the principal elevation; and in doing so would harmfully alter the appreciation of the front of the building, despite being subservient in height to the host dwelling as a whole. This would create a particularly prominent and uncharacteristic feature in the locality. Despite the fact the proposal would cover the existing flat roof and use similar materials to the host dwelling, any such benefits would not be outweighed by the harm I have identified.
7. A section of the existing front large central window and one of the remaining smaller windows at first floor level would be covered over by the extension. As a result, this would erode an important design element to the building, harmfully affecting its appearance. Although the extension would include a hipped roof, the characterful appearance of the roofline of the host building would nevertheless be reduced to the background, behind the bulk and scale of the projecting dormer.
8. For the above reasons the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would be in conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), and supplementary guidance set out in the Council's Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008) which together require, amongst other things, that development should respect the site and its surroundings. It would also conflict with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which relates to achieving well-designed places.
9. Although there may be some economic benefits associated with employment related trade during the construction phase, or by the appellant's continued contribution to local shops and services, these would be relatively small given the nature of development, and I afford these benefits very limited weight.
10. In terms of social benefits, even if there was a particular need for larger, family sized accommodation, this only represents a single property within the overall supply of housing. Although the proposal would provide the appellant with additional accommodation, this would not represent a public benefit or outweigh the harm I have identified above. I therefore give these matters very limited weight.
11. I have not been provided with any evidence to demonstrate a nil level of harm in relation to biodiversity or whether the proposal would exceed the requirements of building regulations. Even if this were the case, it would not outweigh the harm I have found in respect of the protection of the built environment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to accord with the development plan as a whole and therefore the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hills

INSPECTOR