
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 August 2023

by Helen O'Connor LLB MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/22/3312803

3 Parkwood Road, Bournemouth BH5 2BP

- 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 Alican Cicek of Cicek Homes Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2022-5943-E, dated 21 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'First floor extension, extend roof form over extension with larger dormer.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies close to the corner of Parkwood Road with Christchurch Road. The latter is a principal route into Bournemouth, and the surrounding area accommodates a mixture of residential and commercial uses. The nearby townscape is well established and predominantly comprises two and three storey buildings with traditional architecture redolent of the late Victorian and Edwardian eras. The evolution of the area is also reflected in modern infill development, replacement buildings, extensions and alterations, which display a varying degree of sensitivity to the prevailing form. Legibility is derived from the palpable distinction between the prominent buildings lining Christchurch Road as it transitions into the more residential character of Parkwood Road. Overall, the area has a somewhat mixed character, but the underlying ordered layout and traditional built form conveys coherence and a sense of identity.
4. Parkwood Road is one of a semi-detached pair of houses positioned in the transitional area near the corner of Parkwood Road. Together with the adjoining property at no.5, given the residual proportions and architectural detailing still in evidence, it is probable that they were originally single houses dating from the Victorian period. Although alterations have been made to no.3 in part to facilitate its use as a house in multiple occupation, its original symmetrical relationship with no.5 is still discernible. This includes the mirrored principal elevations with a two storey canted bay window feature with detailing over the doors and windows. However, this is not the only element. The former likely

matching plan form can be read from the rear of the building owing to the projecting wing of both properties that share a hipped roof.

5. It is evident that the roof form of no.3 has undergone some alterations that undermine the balance with the simplicity of the slate hipped roof with clay tile ridging still in situ at the adjacent no.5. These alterations mean that the appeal property effectively has a gable end rather than a hipped roof, as well as a large flat roofed box dormer along the side elevation. These features have added bulk and changed the roof form which to an extent detract from the street scene. Nevertheless, overall, the residual underlying qualities identified mean that the appeal property, together with no.5 enriches and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would alter and extend the upper portion of the building along its northern side thereby extending the existing north elevation roof gable and consolidating it with the dormer on the side elevation. Cumulatively, with the roof alterations that have already taken place, the proposal would add considerable volume to the side of the structure and would significantly increase the bulk at upper storey level. The resultant uncharacteristic insensitive shape and complexity of the roof form would appear harmfully disproportionate to the size of the original dwelling.
7. The use of white cladding along the side of the roof alteration proposed would draw the eye and would not reflect the aesthetic nuances of the matt slate tiles and clay ridge tile detailing of the original dwelling.
8. The adverse effects would be compounded as it would harmfully contrast with the clean lines, materials and modest massing of the roof form at no.5. Moreover, it would further detract from the symmetrical balance of the pair.
9. My observations were that, given the elevated position of the alterations, the adverse effects would be visible as one enters and proceeds along Parkwood Road from Christchurch Road. This is acknowledged by the appellant in Fig.14 of their appeal statement. The photograph at Fig.17 illustrates that the increased bulky profile of the roof would be apparent. In addition, views of the side and rear would be possible from Colonnade Road West and from the rear of the properties lining it. To my mind this indicates a high degree of visibility that would exacerbate the extent of harm arising from the proposal. It follows that I cannot agree with the appellant that the alterations would not be highly exposed.
10. The appellant explains that the proposal is intended to regularise and provide a more consistent finish than the present unsympathetic roof form at the appeal property. However, for the reasons outlined, the appeal scheme would ultimately be unsuccessful in that regard as it would augment the already negative aspects of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would exacerbate rather than diminish the harm and would run counter to policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, October 2012 (CS) which seeks new developments that enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the area.
11. For these reasons the proposal would have a harmful, jarring effect on the character and appearance of the area that leads me to find that the proposal would not be well-designed. Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework confirms that development that is not well designed should be

refused. In coming to this view, I have taken account of the points highlighted in the advice regarding roof alterations¹ contained in the Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders, Supplementary Planning Document, 2008.

12. My attention is drawn to the presence of dormer windows with cladding elsewhere in Parkwood Road². However, the examples of dormer windows are considerably smaller than the appeal proposal, and therefore none are directly comparable with the appeal scheme. Whilst I note the general reference to flat roofing at other properties, I have not been provided with the full details of any specific examples. This inhibits a comparison with the appeal proposal in relation to the scale, form, policy context and circumstances that led to those developments. Consequently, these factors carry limited weight in favour of allowing the proposal but would not lead me to a different view.
13. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Hence, it would conflict with policy CS41 of the CS, which amongst other things, seeks a high standard of design that respects and enhances the character of the local area.

Other matters

14. The proposal would have the benefit of providing increased and improved internal accommodation for some of the inhabitants of the house in multiple occupation. However, the limited increase in floorspace proposed curtails the extent of such benefit. I therefore attribute limited weight to it, which would be insufficient to outweigh the harm arising from the main issue.

Conclusion

15. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise³. There are no other considerations that would justify making the decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen O'Connor

Inspector

¹ Section 3.3

² Figs.18 & 19, Appellant's Grounds of Appeal

³ Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.