



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: 4th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/19/3231604

65 Southbourne Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth BH6 3NN

- 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 Clive Elliot against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2019-14745-D, dated 24 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is 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 dwelling, arranged as 3 flats, with a simple hipped roof and a central dormer window on the front and rear roof slope. The appeal site lies on Southbourne Overcliff Drive, a predominantly residential area, and fronts onto the sea. The houses in the general vicinity are mainly characterised by well-proportioned two storey detached dwellings which are generally spaced regularly within their plots. This orderly appearance gives a pleasing rhythm to the street scene, enhanced by the gaps between the appeal site and those surrounding buildings, which gives an overall spacious character. There is a predominantly consistent architectural style of roof form with the majority being hipped, there is a variety of roof additions and extensions including dormer windows, balconies and traditional gables, however these are generally of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the roof.
4. It is proposed to replace the existing hipped roof with full gable features. To the front and rear roof slopes these gables would incorporate glazed areas and to both sides the gables would be blank. Despite utilising the roof space, the proposed gable features would, by virtue of their bulky appearance, excessive scale, elongated ridgeline and harmful projecting gable form, result in visually dominant additions to the roof slope, fundamentally altering the form of the existing hipped roof of the host building. These dominating roof additions due to their scale and form would be contrary to the existing uncomplicated

appearance and compact roof form of the building and would result in a harmful, top-heavy appearance. Therefore, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building.

5. Whilst there is a subtle diversity of scale, design and materials of roof forms within the immediate area, the proposed roof additions to the front and sides, resulting in the loss of the hipped roof form, would clearly be seen when approaching the site from both directions. This would result in highly visible, incongruous additions in the street scene, which would harmfully detract from the relatively unaltered appearance of the roof planes, diminishing the established spacious gaps between buildings, appearing disproportionate additions, as well as being harmful at odds with and uncharacteristic of the area. As such the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Consequently, despite making effective use of the land and building, 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 and Saved Policy 6.10 of the Bournemouth District Wide Local Plan 2002. These policies collectively seek 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 a nearby development, which has planning permission, at 99 Southbourne Overcliff Drive. The appellant says No 99 influenced the proposal. However, I was able to see on my site visit that whilst No 99's gable roof design is similar in design, the appeal proposal is of a greater scale and would extend fully across the roof so as to appear far less subservient than No 99. In any case I must assess each case on its merits.

Conclusion

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

L Crouch

INSPECTOR