



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3309423

19 Springbank Road, Bournemouth BH7 7EL

- 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 Rebecca Johnson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2022-27935-B dated 5 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is side extension to first floor level by building over the existing single storey garage and utility room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side extension to first floor level by building over the existing single storey garage and utility room at 19 Springbank Road, Bournemouth BH7 7EL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 7-2022-27935-B dated 5 August 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) Before the extension hereby permitted is first occupied, the proposed first floor window in the rear (west) elevation of the extension shall be glazed in obscure glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. The window shall thereafter be retained as installed.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: SR-123 -01 A; SR-123 -02 and SR-123 -03 and SR-123 -04.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and on the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey property within a predominantly residential area. The surrounding properties appear to have been built at a

similar time, but are of a number of different designs, characterised by a similar palette of materials and strong clean and uncluttered lines to the facades and roof profiles. There is a varied pattern to the spacing of properties with some properties much closer to their neighbours than others.

4. The proposal would build a first floor extension over the existing garage, continuing the ridge line to the main property with modest projecting bays to the front and to the rear under shallow gable roofs.
5. I have taken into account the advice set out under the Council's Design Guide: Residential Extensions (September 2008) and have noted that the proposal would not accord with all the specific guidance in respect of side extensions. It would, however, be of modest width in relation to the existing dwelling. The first floor addition would align with and not project further than the existing projections and would, at roof level, be under a gable roof set down from the main roof ridge. Taking all these factors together, the proposal would be in keeping with the scale and proportions of the existing property and would not appear an over dominant addition.
6. In addition, by maintaining the main roof line, it would continue the design approach of the existing house and surrounding properties of clean lines whilst avoiding an over complicated solution with a variety of changes and alterations to the roof and façade profiles.
7. I also do not consider that it would create a terracing effect with the neighbouring property at No 17 given the remaining gap to the boundary with the adjoining property. The remaining gap, over two storeys, would not be dissimilar to a number of the gaps found between properties in the immediate local area and so would respect the characteristic pattern of development.
8. I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and of the local area. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy CS41 of the adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) and the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters, seek for a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. The proposal would not fully accord with all the guidance in the Design Guide, particularly in respect of side extensions, but I have found that it would accord with the first of the Design Principles set out in Section 2 to maintain the character of the house and its setting. In the particular circumstances of this case, I am therefore satisfied that would be justification for an exception to be made to the SPD.

Other Considerations

10. The Appellant has drawn my attention to other extensions permitted and undertaken in the local area. However, each proposal must be considered on the basis of its individual planning merits and that has been the basis of my consideration and decision in this case.
11. I agree with the Council that there would be no material harm to the immediate neighbours in terms of impact of light and noise and disturbance given the modest scale of the addition to an existing residential property and its relationship to neighbouring properties. The requirement for the rear facing window to be completed with obscure glass and be non-openable below 1.7m

above the floor level of that room would ensure that there would be no overlooking and loss of privacy to the neighbours.

Conditions and Conclusion

12. In terms of conditions, matching materials with the existing dwelling are required in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the existing property and of the local area. I shall also add a condition to list the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
13. A condition should also be imposed as requested by the Council to ensure that the rear window, serving a bathroom, is completed with obscure glass and be non-openable below 1.7m above the floor level of that room, in order to protect the amenities of neighbours.
14. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR