The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/W/17/3172169
42 Seaward Avenue, Bournemouth BH6 3SH

- 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 S Kobryn against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
- The application Ref 7-2016-24225-B, dated 15 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
- The development proposed is a roof extension to allow the formation of a second floor, to include dormer window roof light and balcony.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Seaward Avenue is a residential area, it is primarily characterised by detached two storey residential properties. The vast majority of the buildings have hipped roofs facing the street. Some incorporate forward projecting gable features. These typically sit below the main ridge line and they add variety to the street scene; however the hipped nature of the main roof slopes remains an overriding characteristic of the area. This has created uniformity in the street that significantly contributes to its locally distinctive character.

4. The appeal property has a hipped roof in keeping with the prevailing roof forms. The development would result in this being altered and introduce a full gable to the frontage which would incorporate a balcony. It would project significantly forward from the plane of the main front roof slopes on the surrounding properties. This would appear harmfully discordant with the hipped roof forms that are characteristic of the street. Although the overall volume that would be added to the building would be relatively small, the development would nevertheless undermine the locally distinctive character of the area.

5. Alterations have been made to a number of properties, some of which include front dormers and front balconies. These however have been provided whilst still retaining the main front hipped roof form. There are some examples of full gables at the rear of properties, visible from Fisherman's Walk, but these do not impact on the character of the area when seen from Seaward Avenue. Properties at the very end of the Avenue are of a significantly different

character, particularly those at the southern end of the street. Their position, on corner plots, marks a transition between Seaward Avenue and Southbourne Overcliff Drive where properties of a different character and scale are present. This is a significantly different context to the appeal property, which sits more centrally in the Avenue. Although there is some variety within the roof forms, none persuade me that the appeal scheme is acceptable.

6. The development would result in an increase in the ridge height. This would be slight and not be significantly noticeable. There would also be a flat roofed side dormer window. It would sit back from the frontage of the property and have a similar appearance to other side dormers in the street. In themselves, these features would not result in harm; however they also do not minimise the harm that would arise from the front gable.

7. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, adopted October 2012 (the CS) which seeks to ensure that development is designed to respect the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. It would also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework to reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other matters

8. In 2009 the Council granted planning permission for a scheme that included a comparable gable feature and a side dormer window of a slightly different design. I have taken this permission into account and I give it significant weight. However, I note that since the date of that permission the CS has been adopted. The Council has identified conflict with its document *Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders*. This was published prior to the grant of the previous permission. Although I have taken this document into account I have primarily had regard to the relevant Development Plan policy.

9. The development would provide improved living accommodation for the appellant at a site that is located in an accessible location, resulting in moderate social benefits and some economic benefits from the construction.

10. Due to the position of the scheme, and the proposed incorporation of obscure glazing in the side dormer which could also have restricted opening, the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents. This indicates a lack of harm but does little to weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. The adverse effects of the development are sufficient to mean that it would conflict with the Development Plan when taken as a whole. The previous grant of permission and the social and economic benefits do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, and the associated environmental harm and conflict with the Development Plan.

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR