



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2024

by H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3339535

10 Hosker Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH5 2DD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Brown against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2023-29016.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey extension to front and rear, Dormer to rear and remodel.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Single storey extension to front and rear. Loft conversion with dormer to rear and roof lights - remodel at 10 Hosker Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH5 2DD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2023-29016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing Nos:

Proposed site plan 1996P/100a,
Block and location plan 1996P/101,
Existing floor plan 1996P/102,
Existing elevations 1996P/103a,
Proposed floor plans 1996P/104d,
Proposed elevations 1996P/105b,
Proposed elevations 1996P/106a, and
SUDs plan 1996P/107.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the Council's decision notice and which the appellant has used on the Appeal Form is more precise. I have relied on this description in my determination of the appeal and it is as set out in the formal decision above.
3. The reason for refusal refers to the impact on 8 Hosker Road, however, it is clear from the officer report and the site visit that this is an error and it should be 12 Hosker Road. The appellant has also identified this error in their statement. Therefore, no prejudice would arise if I consider the appeal on this basis and I have done so.

4. At the time of the site visit it was noted that some extension works to the property were in the process of being constructed. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the plans provided with the application.
5. During the appeal the appellant provided a copy of a Certificate of Lawful Development for the loft conversion with dormer window and roof lights reference: 7-2024-29016-A dated 27 February 2024. The Council were given the opportunity to comment on the submission of this evidence.

Main Issue(s)

6. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the dormer window on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - the effect of the rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of 12 Hosker Road with particular reference to outlook and loss of light.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal property is a mid terrace house positioned on a residential side street, off Seabourne Road, a busy street with various commercial uses.
8. The residential properties on Hosker Road have some variety in terms of architecture but follow themes in respect of materials and features such as bay windows and roof forms.
9. Although similar from the front, the rear of 8, 10 and 12 Hosker Road differ in appearance. Whilst the properties may have been similar when they were originally constructed there is no longer any consistency with the fenestration arrangement to the rear elevations. Nos 8 and 12 both have two storey extensions with the one at No 8 being particularly sizable.
10. The proposed dormer window has a contemporary design with a cubelike form and a large window on the front. The materials of the dormer would be similar to those proposed on other parts of the development to the rear of the property, including the rear extension and cladding to the existing dormer.
11. Although the dormer is relatively large it does not dominate the roof slope, with just under half of the roof remaining unaltered. The recessive material proposed, having a similar colour to the roof, along with the large amount of glazing means that it appears as a comfortable addition within the roof. Although it would be a modern addition to the property this does not make it inappropriate. It would take a different form to the existing dormer on the property however it is set within a different part of the roof and the materials would be consistent.
12. The Residential Extensions Design Guide is a prescriptive document which states that the size and location of dormer windows should be informed by the pattern of windows on the house and that dormers with flat roofs and horizontal emphasis should be avoided. Given that there is a lack of uniformity to the rear of the terrace the siting of the dormer within the roof would not be inconsistent with any overriding theme. Whilst flat roof dormers may be

resisted, in this instance the flat roof is part of the modern design and is not a harmful design feature.

13. In conclusion, the dormer window and other proposed extensions would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. They would accord with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (BLPCS) and BAP2 of the Boscombe and Pokesdown Neighbourhood Plan (BPNP). These require, amongst other things, that proposals respond to local character and distinctiveness, while ensuring the appearance and scale of proposals is acceptable in the context of existing development. Although there would be some technical breaches of aspects of the SPD, the proposal would accord with its aims insofar as being subordinate to the host building, while respecting the pattern of development in the street. The design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework as set out in Chapter 12 would also be met.

Living conditions

14. The appeal statement and delegated report state that the proposed extension would project approximately 9 metres beyond the rear elevation of the house and the neighbouring property. The extension has been designed with a shallow pitch to the roof. There is an existing high fence along the boundary with No 12.
15. There is a window at ground floor of the rear of No12 and also a lengthy outbuilding extension. The outlook from this window is already limited by the presence of the boundary fence and their existing extension. As such the area immediate to the house is already hemmed-in to some degree.
16. The extension would be single storey with a low pitched roof and would not project much above the boundary fence being offset from the boundary to mitigate its impact. The extension would have an effect on the outlook from the rear window of No 12 reducing the available views to some degree above the fence. As the extension breaches the 45 degree line the window would also be affected by some loss of light. Somewhat of a corridor effect would be created between the properties, however, this would not be significantly worse than the impact of the fence. Overall, the extension would reduce outlook and light levels affecting the living conditions of the occupiers of No 12 to a perhaps limited but harmful extent.
17. Prior Approval has been granted for a 6-metre extension at the appeal property with the same width as the proposed extension. Given that construction has commenced on site this option is a realistic alternative and more than a theoretical possibility. Significant weight is attached to this Prior Approval being in place and the impact that this fallback option would have on the neighbouring property.
18. Whilst the proposed extension would be longer than the approved extension the impact on the outlook from the window concerned would not be vastly different. This is a relevant factor in terms of considering whether the extension would be oppressive. The main part of the garden remains open and unaffected by the development. On balance any harm to outlook or any oppressive feeling would not be substantially worse when comparing the approved and proposed extensions.

19. A similar conclusion is also drawn when considering light. The Council acknowledges that the 45-degree line is not breached in elevation form and this would be the same for the proposed and approved extension. Any further loss of light compared to the approved extension would not be harmful.
20. I conclude, the impact of the proposed extension would not cause significantly greater harm to the living conditions of No 12 than the Prior Approval scheme and therefore there would be no conflict with policy CS41 of the BLPCS, or the Bournemouth Residential Extensions Design Guide.

Conditions

21. The standard time limit is imposed as condition 1 and the approved plans as condition 2 in the interests of certainty.
22. The Council suggested that the materials should be conditioned to match the existing building. However, the materials proposed differ from those on the existing house. The materials proposed on the plans are similar in colour and texture to other materials on the property and would not appear out of keeping. A condition to ensure that the materials match the house is not therefore necessary.

Conclusion

23. For the above reasons the proposal accords with the development plan. I therefore conclude the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions set out.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR