



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 July 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3342628

40 Harland Road, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH6 4DW

- 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 Spencer France against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2024-12351-E.
 - The development proposed was described as the erection of *'two storey extensions and new roof with attic bedroom and balcony'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and erection of a two-storey front/side/rear extension with a rear balcony on the first-floor, conversion of loft to habitable use with new roof, 3 x dormer windows, and internal alterations, involving demolition of existing detached garage at 40 Harland Road, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH6 4DW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2024-12351-E, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Location Plan at scale 1:1250, Block Plan at scale 1:500, Street Scene View at scale 1:100, Drg No 002, Drg No Rev October 2023 Rev C, and Proposed SUDS Scheme dated October 2023.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The proposed first-floor balcony on the rear elevation shall be provided with 1.8m high privacy screens in accordance with the plans hereby approved with the privacy screens sited on the outer side (northwest and southeast) elevations before the balcony hereby approved is first used. The privacy screens shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest equivalent standard) and thereafter shall be permanently maintained and retained as such.
 - 5) The proposed second-floor dormer window in the northwest (side) elevation of the building serving the stairway shall be glazed with obscure glass to a level equivalent to Pilkington Level 3 or above (or the nearest

equivalent standard) and non-opening below 1.7m above floor-level and shall be permanently maintained and retained as such.

- 6) The proposed roof light windows in the northwest and southeast (side) elevations of the building shall be high level type, positioned at least 1.7m above floor-level and shall be permanently maintained and retained as such.

Procedural Matter

2. My formal decision uses a description for the development which was given on the Council's decision notice and which was repeated by the appellant in their appeal submissions. This is a more accurate and appropriate description for the entirety of the works compared with that which was given on the application form and which I have quoted in the banner heading above.

Background and Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider street scene.

Reasons

4. No 40 Harland Road is a two-storey, detached dwelling within a residential neighbourhood. Harland Road comprises an eclectic mix of principally detached dwellings.
5. No 40 was the subject of a planning permission, Ref 7-2023-12351-D, given in September 2023 for development described as '*Alterations and erection of a two storey front/side/rear extension with a rear balcony on the first floor, conversion of loft to habitable use with 3 x dormer windows, and internal alterations, involving demolition of existing detached garage*'. That permission remains extant and would involve a significant remodelling of the existing dwelling, including a new front projecting gable feature, alterations to the building's roof profile to create a flat crown, dormer windows to the front, side and rear roof slopes, and a single-storey rear extension with a balcony over. The appeal proposal is for a variation of the consented scheme with the principal key changes, as summarised by the Council, including: an increased area of flat roof; an enlargement of the rear dormer window; an enlargement of the front dormer window; and an increased height to the front gable feature.
6. The Council has raised no concern over the alternative sizes proposed for the front dormer and front gable feature. I have no reason to disagree.
7. The changes to the roof profile would alter the pitch of that consented from an angle of 41 degrees to 45 degrees. As a consequence, the area of flat roof would increase, with the ridge lengths and heights of the four surrounding roof slopes increasing commensurately. In addition, the proposed rear dormer window would increase in width.
8. The Council's *Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders* (the Design Guide) was adopted in 2008. It deals with roof alterations at section 3.3. It advises that changing the whole profile of the roof form, usually from a pitched roof to a gable, can be highly visible in the street scene and is not always an appropriate solution for a loft conversion. It goes on to list points that should be noted, principally relating to dormer windows, including advising that dormers with a horizontal emphasis and flat roofs should be avoided. The

Design Guide does not deal explicitly with flat crown roofs when discussing roof alterations but in the context of rear extensions it advises that flat roofed additions are normally only appropriate on very small single-storey extensions.

9. With regard to the crown, the Council has stated that the area of flat roof that was last proposed was considered to be a negative aspect of the scheme but which, on balance, was considered acceptable. Notwithstanding, alterations to the appeal property to include a flat crown have already been sanctioned and I find little to discern any difference between the approved scheme and that now proposed. I saw some noticeable height differentials between the ridge lines of some neighbouring properties along Harland Road. Although the ridge height of the roof to No 40 would rise by 0.45m, this would not be significant for it to appear out of keeping amongst its contemporaries along this side of the road.
10. I find nothing about the roofscape of the appeal proposal, including the angle of the roof's pitch, which would appear out of kilter with or disproportionate to the building overall. Furthermore, my attention has been drawn to works underway at 62 Harland Road following a grant of planning permission in May 2022 (Ref 7-2022-11180-D), and just a short distance from the appeal site on the same side of the road. The original building in that case has been amended to include a flat crown to the roof, and a roof pitch of 45 degrees according to undisputed comments made by the appellant. Nothing about those alterations, which I saw for myself during my visit, stood out as incongruous or harmful to the street scene.
11. The rear dormer would conflict with the Design Guide by virtue of its flat roof and horizontal proportions. But again, I find little to discern any difference between the permitted rear dormer and that now proposed. The new proposed dormer would be 0.3m wider but it would remain set well below the ridge line up from the eaves, and in from the sides of the roof. Its additional width would not, to my mind, change its proportions significantly to render its presence harmful.
12. The extant planning permission is a material consideration to which I attribute a significant amount of weight in my determination of this appeal. In my judgement the differences between the consented scheme for No 40 and that which is now proposed are minimal. Moreover, I am satisfied that the changes to No 40 would result in a remodelled building that would be comfortable in its setting. As such, I find no conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012 as far as it requires new development to respect the site and its surroundings.

Conditions

13. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council in the event I allow the appeal, along with those imposed upon the extant permission.
14. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the development is finished in materials to match the existing dwelling.
15. In order to safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, conditions are necessary to secure privacy screens to the sides of the proposed first-floor

balcony, to control the glazing and opening height of the windows in the side dormer, and to control the height of the roof lights on the side roof slopes.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 40 Harland Road or the wider street scene. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR