

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6TH December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/23/3329068
29 Penrith Road, Bournemouth BH5 1LT

- 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 & Mrs Rankmore against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application ref. 7-2022-23734-B, dated 24 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2023.
 - The proposal is for erection of a single storey rear extension, a first floor side extension with installation of 1 x balcony to rear and 2 x balconies to front, formation of third floor within new roof space and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached chalet bungalow on Penrith Road with off-street parking to the front. It is located within a row of other properties of differing scale and architectural style. The immediate vicinity is predominantly residential in nature.
 4. The proposal broadly involves the enlargement of the ground and first floor accommodation and raising the ridge line with rooms above in the roof. The design would include two projecting single storey front elements with balconies over, a triangular dormer window in the centre of the front roof slope and two further triangular dormer windows in the rear roof slope.
 5. The re-modelled house would be clearly visible from the public domain and the surrounding curtilages of other properties in the vicinity. In my view, the extent of development would not be sympathetic to the relatively modest scale of the existing chalet bungalow. The cumulative impact of the mass and bulk at first floor level and in the roof, together with the prominent dormer window features, would appear dominant and obtrusive within the context of the existing chalet and the local streetscene.
-

6. I appreciate that the locality comprises houses and blocks of flats of varying size and design. However, the appeal proposals would involve detrimental extensions to an existing building, and I have no evidence that there are other such instances in the neighbourhood that are comparable to the scheme before me. I note the appellant's reference to the alterations at 18 Penrith Road and 40 Keswick Road, however these developments would appear to have retained the chalet designs of the original dwellings, and do not involve excessive alterations at upper floor levels. In any event, the appearance of other dwellings would be a neutral consideration in any balance against planning harm, and I am heedful that each case must be assessed on its own merits.
7. I acknowledge those other matters that have been advanced in support of the development; there is no objection to the principle of extending the property, amended plans were submitted to the Council during the course of the application in an attempt to address the Authority's concerns, there would be no adverse harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding residences, and the proposal retains a sufficient amount of rear curtilage. However, none of these points could justify the harm I have identified.
8. The appellant states that the appeal dwelling could be extended under the permitted development rights. It is contended that any such additions would be more harmful than the appeal scheme, and as such this represents a viable fallback position.
9. This matter has been recognised by the Council's case officer in the delegated report, and images have been provided in the appellant's grounds of appeal. To my mind, the images show a building that would be more sympathetic to the design and appearance of the existing house. Therefore I consider that the fallback position would not counterbalance the arguments above.
10. My attention is drawn to an amended design that has been permitted by the Council since the appeal was submitted. The approved plans show a scheme of lower height and revised detailing, which to my mind would be more cohesive within the context of the site and surrounds. Therefore I consider that the existence of the permission would not justify the appeal proposals before me.
11. I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the local area. It would be in conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012, Policy BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan 2019, and the Council's adopted Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008), which collectively seek to secure new development of acceptable scale and appearance. It would also be inconsistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

12. Having regard to the above and all other matters advanced, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR