



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2019

by L Crouch BA (Hons) MSc IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/19/3233468

83 Southbourne Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth BH6 3NW

- 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 and Mrs Lyle against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-20649-D, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached two storey well-proportioned dwelling in a Georgian style, with a modest, shallow pitched hipped roof. The hipped roof due to its proportions and design has an unassuming appearance and is set discreetly behind a parapet wall. There is an existing dormer window on the rear roof slope.
4. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area. The houses in the general vicinity are of a variety of scales and roof forms. The houses in the immediate area are mainly characterised by well-proportioned detached dwellings, which are generally spaced regularly within their plots. Where alteration has taken place to the roofs it has generally been achieved sensitively and modestly.
5. It is proposed to replace the existing hipped roof with a mansard style roof. This would result in the roof pitch being increased significantly to a near vertical alignment, appearing more visible above the parapet wall. This would also produce a significant expanse of flat roof, the bulk of which would be discernible from the side elevations and readily visible within the street-scene. Despite mansard roofs not being uncommon on Georgian style buildings, the proposed roof would, by virtue of its excessive overall scale and increase in volume, elongated ridgeline and significant, noticeable expanse of flat roof from the side, would result in visually dominant and top-heavy addition appearing at odds with the well-proportioned building.

6. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy 2012. This policy seeks amongst other things to ensure high quality design, which respects or enhances the character and appearance of the area and has appropriate materials, scale and massing to the property and its surroundings.
7. The proposal is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), which places a clear emphasis on achieving well designed places and good design.
8. There would also be conflict with the principles set out in the accompanying Bournemouth Borough Council's Design Guide for Householders Residential Extensions adopted 2008, which seeks well-designed alterations and extensions that respect the character of the existing house and street.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has brought to my attention other nearby properties which have mansard roofs. However, I was able to see on my site visit that these were not numerous in the immediate area, and those few mansard roofs were of a significant, dominant scale and not characteristic of the area. In any case I must assess each case on its merits.
10. The appellant identified that discussions have been ongoing with the Council to reach an acceptable agreement to both parties. However, I must assess the proposal before me.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

L Crouch

INSPECTOR