
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2017

by H Porter BA(Hons) PGDip IHBC

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

Decision date: 13th October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3181350

127 Southbourne Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth BH6 3NP

- 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 Messrs European Emerging Markets Ltd against the decision of Bournemouth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2017-25326-D, dated 10 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of garage with room within the roof form.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site and its neighbours have rear gardens that step down and extend towards Bolton Road and Bolton Close. The rearmost portion of these garden plots provides access, off-street parking and host a variety of single-storey outbuildings. In scale, form and detailing, these structures present an informal type of development, clearly ancillary to the Southbourne Overcliff Drive houses, and distinct from the two-storey detached dwellings that address Bolton Road.
4. The appeal site has a comparatively longer plot, which extends a forward of the prevailing rear boundary line and directly onto Bolton Road. Owing to its position, therefore, the appeal site is particularly prominent in views southwards along Bolton Road. The Council has previously granted planning permission for the erection of a garage at the appeal site. This permission, which has not been implemented, sought to ensure that the overall scale and form of the garage was such that the consequent effect upon the Bolton Road street scene was acceptable.
5. The appeal proposal seeks to modify the design of the permitted garage in order to accommodate a first floor room. The appeal scheme would occupy the same footprint and involve a marginal increase in the eaves height. However, the roof pitch and overall form would be materially different. The north (Bolton Road) roof slope would have steeper pitch, reaching to a ridge that would be

over half a meter above that which has been permitted. The ridge would also be elongated, extending to the south (garden) elevation. Even though views to the building's south elevation would be restricted, by omitting the step down and lower pitched roof element, the current scheme would nonetheless appear bulky and inelegant.

6. The proposed garage would be lower and narrower compared with the Bolton Road dwellings, however, it would be significantly larger than the neighbouring outbuildings. Given the ground level changes, the proposed structure would, in my judgement, still appear as ancillary to the principal dwelling. This notwithstanding, it would lack architectural subtlety and result in an awkward and contrived development. In combination with the site's prominent position and irregular shape, the scale and bulk of the proposal would be dominant and prominent viewed from Bolton Road and Bolton Close. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the appeal scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed development would thereby run contrary to the objectives of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, 2012, which seeks to ensure that all development and spaces are well designed and of a high quality, and that development respects the site and its surroundings. The proposal would also fail to accord with the guidance within 'Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders', 2008, which states that the overall height of a garage should be carefully considered, having regard to the predominant heights of existing garages and how the structure will appear in the street scene. Moreover, the development would run contrary to the policies and core principles within the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012 (the Framework), namely those which seek to secure high quality design.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would not accord with the development plan or the Framework. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Porter

INSPECTOR