

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2023

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/23/3315197
37 Stourfield Road, Bournemouth BH5 2AR

- 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 Towler against the decision of the BCP Council.
 - The application, Ref. 7-2022-28696-A, dated 15 September 2022 was refused by notice dated 18 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed as regards the first floor rear extension and allowed in respect of the construction of a ground floor rear extension at 37 Stourfield Road, Bournemouth in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 7-2022-28696-A, dated 15 September 2022, subject to the condition that the development shall be completed in accordance with details shown on the (in part) approved Drawing No. Series 257.GA: Plan Nos: 01; 02; 03; 04; 05.1 & 06.

Preliminary Matter

2. The construction of the extensions has in large measure been completed. The application is therefore for retrospective permission.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Turning firstly to the ground floor extension, the Council considers that because of the relatively large size of the extension, the flat roof is inappropriate and contrary to the Residential Extensions Design Guide for Householders 2008 ('the Council's Design Guide'). However, the extension cannot be seen from the public realm and the rear of the properties in Stourfield Road have a wide variety of original designs and subsequent alterations and additions.
 5. There is therefore no clear consistency of character and appearance with which the extension needs to accord. And because of this and the boundary fences, the building is read on its own rather than together with the rear of nearby dwellings. The depth of 3.5m is a relatively modest addition and the Council's and other LPA's design guidance notwithstanding, it is commonplace for ground
-

- floor flat roof extensions of similar and greater depths to be constructed under permitted development and prior approval procedures.
6. I acknowledge that the extension is not in keeping with the more traditional design of the host dwelling, but with its clean lines and full height glazing it has a contemporary 'feel' that in itself is not unpleasing. On balance, I consider that the ground floor extension would not materially have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore not be in unacceptably harmful conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012 ('the Local Plan').
 7. Turning to the first floor extension, in contrast to the ground floor addition, I consider that extending the main roof of the dwelling is a proposal that is more closely integrated with the character of the original building derived from the architectural style of its period, in this case late Victorian. And whilst the flat roof does not have a significant impact on the street scene, albeit it can be partially seen in the gap with No. 39, the addition is clearly at odds with a 'well mannered' design appropriate to the building and its context.
 8. Even though in this case the flat roof is fairly limited in scale, it is in notable contrast with the hipped roof of the host dwelling and its neighbours, and compared with an extension that is in keeping with this design it is an addition of poor quality. As the officer's report says, it would be noticeable to the neighbours and in addition to it being incongruous to the appearance of No. 37, it would to some extent affect the character of the surrounding area.
 9. The grounds of appeal refer to other extensions of a different design to the original properties in the area, but I do not consider that these justify a further development that would be of a poor standard. Nor have any technical reasons been put forward to justify a flat roof as opposed to a hipped roof.
 10. I therefore conclude that this extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of No. 37 Stourfield Road and its surroundings. The extension would therefore be in harmful conflict with Local Plan Policy CS41; Government policy in Section 12: 'Achieving Well-Designed Places' of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021, and Section 3.1 of the Council's Design Guide.
 11. For these reasons the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor extension. Returning to the ground floor extension in respect of which the appeal is allowed, I have imposed the standard condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the (in part) approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. However, I note that the officer's report has referred to a discrepancy as to the length of the extension.
 12. This discrepancy, if it exists, is not readily apparent, not least because I am unable to scale the digital plans in the appeal file. Accordingly I should make it clear that I consider the external dimensions of the extension as built to be acceptable, notwithstanding any discrepancies with the submitted drawings.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR