



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: 27 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3310239
25 Dulsie Road, Bournemouth BH3 7DY

- 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 Derek McKerl against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2022-28274-A dated 31 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed enlargement to a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an existing bungalow with some accommodation in the roof, lit mainly by rooflights and a tile hung side dormer, on the south east side of Dulsie Road, and within a predominantly residential area. The properties are generally regularly spaced and a number of the single storey properties have been altered and extended to introduce accommodation at first floor with a range of different design solutions, including raised ridge heights, dormers and roof lights.
4. The proposal would seek to regularise the floor plan by building forward the front, south-western side in line with the existing forward projection and regularising the rear elevation to provide a 'square' footprint. Along with other alterations, it would increase the ridge height and introduce a partially hipped dormer to each side roof slope and two triangular shaped dormers to the front roof slope. The rear would become a gable end under a flat roof with, at first floor, a central full length window with a Juliette balcony flanked by two further windows.
5. The front dormers, as a result of their siting and size, would be very prominent on the front roof slope. They would be conspicuously wide in relation to the width of the roof and would be overly large in scale in relation to the width and proportions of the ground floor bay windows below. Their overdominance on the front roof slope would be exacerbated as they would extend on each side to

the roof edge. They would also be sited comparatively low down on the front roof slope and as a result, there would also be an unsatisfactory relationship in terms of siting of the side roof dormers which would be set at a different height on the roof plane. The very different style and form of the side dormers would exacerbate the poor relationship with the front dormers.

6. The change to the ridge form with an area of flat roof at the front and then a lower ridge to the rear would also appear as a jarring element. Taken altogether, the proposed extensions and alterations would create a top heavy and incongruous extension which would be out of keeping with the scale and proportions of the existing bungalow.
7. As a result, it would also appear visually over prominent in the street scene both from the front and when approaching along the street, from either side. I have noted that the ridge height would not be dissimilar to the ridge heights on the properties on either side, but the addition of the differing roof forms and the style of dormers to the front and the side would result in the building becoming visually intrusive in and harmful to the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not respect but would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CS41 of the adopted Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) as well as the provisions of the Residential Design Guidance (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters, seek a high quality of design which respects the local context.
9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR