



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by G Roberts BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3308887

7 Townsville Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3HL

- 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 Lucy Bradshaw & James Stevens against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application Ref. 7-2022-28437-A, dated 20 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is installation of rear extension and roof conversion with 3 dormer windows to existing bungalow and conversion of outbuilding to Summer House.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of rear extension and roof conversion with 3 dormer windows to existing bungalow and conversion of outbuilding to Summer House at 7 Townsville Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 7-2022-28437-A dated 20 June 2022, 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 be in accordance with those shown on the Application Form.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1811R1.001; 1811R1.002; 1811R1.005; 1811R1.006; and 1811R1.007.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have adopted the description of development as it appears on the decision notice as this more accurately describes the appeal proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - (a) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and,
 - (b) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal proposal involves the refurbishment and extension of a detached single storey bungalow located within a good sized plot on the southern side of Townsville Road. The appeal proposal also includes the conversion of an existing rear outbuilding to a summer house, to which the Council have raised no objection.
5. The surrounding area comprises similar detached bungalows, as well as some two storey properties. The bungalows, as well as the two storey properties, vary in terms of their style, scale, roof form, ridge heights and materials. There is no uniform design, and a number of the bungalows have been altered and extended to include gable ends or cropped gable ends, dormers, and roof and rear extensions. There are also some examples of where bungalows sit comfortably next to two storey properties.
6. Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012) (BLP) seeks, amongst other requirements, to ensure that new development is well designed, of a high quality and that through its scale, density, layout and siting respects and where possible enhances the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding area. A broadly similar approach is set out in paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (Framework), but of notable importance is that this paragraph also states that being sympathetic to local character should not prevent or discourage appropriate innovation or change. Similarly, paragraph 134 b) of the Framework states that significant weight should be given to innovative designs that help raise the standard of design more generally in an area provided the proposal fits in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.
7. The Council have also referred to its Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (Design Guide). Although no specific paragraphs are highlighted in the reason for refusal or in the Council's Delegated Report (CDG), the latter states that the Design Guide's advice is that extensions and alterations should respect the original character, be subservient to the host property and should not overly dominate it. Even so, I note that section 3.1 of the Design Guide, 'Roof alterations', principally deals with new dormers but also states that changing a pitched roof to a gable can only be successfully achieved in certain locations, with an example of how the latter could be done on a bungalow included in section 4.1, 'Inspiration design'.
8. It would appear from the Design Guide and the CDG that the former is not an adopted Supplementary Planning Document but best practice guidance containing general advice on house extensions and alterations. The copy I have been provided is dated September 2008, predating both the Framework and National Design Guide (NDG) (January 2021). The latter reinforces the Framework, for example, at paragraph 44 by emphasising that well designed places do not need to copy their surroundings and that it is appropriate for new development to include innovation and change to reflect how we live today. As such, whilst the Design Guide remains a material consideration, the weight it can be accorded in the decision making process is in my view limited.
9. Within the above context, whilst the proposed hip to gable roof extension, with raised ridge, would result in an increase in the bulk of the host property this

would not be significant or harmful to the host or streetscene. Hip to gable extensions are often used successfully to secure new accommodation at roof level and given the varied character of the road this aspect of the proposal would not appear out of keeping within the streetscene. The proposed pallet of materials and three new dormers on the west elevation, that sit comfortably on the extended roof and assist in securing a high quality of design to the front and side elevations.

10. I accept that there would be a material change to the scale and design of the host property when viewed from the road, but, even so, all the proposed changes would refresh and modernise the appearance of the front and side elevations whose current design is not of any quality or merit. The result would be an improvement on existing that would enhance the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.
11. The modern design would also be reflected in the proposed rear extension, through the use of a similar pallet of materials and gable end detailing. Although it is a large extension, I disagree with the Council and consider that the extension would integrate well with the remodelled and altered appearance of the host property. As such, it would assist in raising the standard of design within the area and at the same time secure a development that fits in reasonably well with its surroundings. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed development would be proportional and would sit comfortably on the appeal site and would not appear overly dominant, incongruous or visually prominent. As such, the proposal would not appear out of character or result in any material harm to the streetscene.
12. Accordingly, whilst there would be some conflict with the advice in the Design Guide, as I have found, this predates the Framework and NDG and has not apparently been adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document. Moreover, as the introduction to the Design Guide acknowledges, it contains general advice and best practice guidance on extensions and alterations. It should, therefore, be applied flexibly having regard to the individual circumstances of the case and the need to make effective use of land within sustainable locations such as the appeal site. I find, therefore, that the appeal proposal would be compliant with policy CS41 of the BLP and the corresponding paragraphs of the Framework, and would not materially conflict with the aims and objectives of the Design Guide.

Neighbours living conditions

13. The proposed rear extension and roof conversion would not increase the existing footprint of the host property. The proposed extension would incorporate the existing single storey flat roof extension at the rear of the host, which abuts the common boundary with 5 Townsville Road (No.5). This would be extended upwards to form part of the new gable ended roof. Even though the existing flat roof element lies close to the common boundary, the proposed gable ended roof would slope away from this boundary, with its highest part, the ridge, set well back from the common boundary with No.5. Combined with the fact that the host property's footprint would remain as existing, the resulting impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.5 would not in my view be significant.
14. The Council appear to accept that there would be no loss of sunlight or daylight or any impact from overshadowing. Whilst I accept that the proposed

extension would be visible from the rear garden of No.5, this fact alone does not in any way lead to the proposal having an overbearing impact and most new development will be visible to some extent. I accept that there would be some visual impact, but given the location and design of the proposed extension, the fact that the footprint of the host would not change, that views from the rear of No.5 down its rear garden would not be affected and the fact that the new extension/roof would be sited north west of No.5, the level of impact would not be sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission.

15. Concerns have also been raised by interested parties with regard to overlooking. I note from the CDG that the Council were satisfied that there would be no loss of privacy and did not therefore object to the proposal on this basis. I concur with the Council's findings in this respect. Any views from the proposed first floor rear windows would be at an oblique angle, towards the rearmost part of the garden to No.5 and over existing boundary treatment. Moreover, the relationships that arise would reflect those commonly found in built up suburban areas such as this, where some overlooking of adjoining gardens is an inherent characteristic. Overall, whilst the proposed first floor rear windows would result in some overlooking this would be limited and would not result in any significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.
16. Accordingly, I find that the appeal proposal would not lead to any significant harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of No.5 or any other neighbouring occupiers and would, therefore, be compliant in this respect with policy CS41 of the BLP and paragraph 130 f) of the Framework.

Conditions

17. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the advice in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance chapter on the use of planning conditions. A condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans is necessary and reasonable to secure a high-quality development. I have added a list of approved plans for clarity. I have also added a condition that requires the materials to be used to reflect those listed in the Application Form.

Conclusion

18. 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