



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

**by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25 March 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/20/3244328**

**119 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 Mr Ian Parsons against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
  - The application Ref 7-2019-24230-D, dated 9 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2019.
  - The development proposed is a new roof.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new roof at 119 Southbourne Overcliff Drive, Bournemouth BH6 3NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2019-24230-D, dated 9 August 2019, 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 following plans; Drawing No.s 1789.01, 1789.02, 1789.13B, 1789.15A and 1789.16.
  - 3) Prior to installation details and/or samples of the external materials for the roof, windows and doors shall be submitted to and be approved in writing by the local planning authority. Once agreed the development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved materials.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. 119 Southbourne Overcliff Drive is located within a row of generally detached houses on a gentle curve within the road. There are elements of rhythm to the row with the general height and proportions of buildings, and in particular the front gables. However, the character is also formed by the individual buildings with their often contemporary variations. These variations are found with a few dwellings having balconies within the gable at roof level, different designs of the front first floor balcony projections and with some mix of colours and materials to the elevations. This group of dwellings reflects the character of the

- wider predominantly residential area where the individual features to many of the properties provide a contemporary feel that reflects its coastal location.
4. No 119 is now substantially constructed following the grant of planning permission for a dwelling. The approved roof form, which is yet to be added, would be reasonably traditional in appearance with a window in the front gable and roof lights in the front sloping part of the roof.
  5. The proposal seeks to alter the approved roof form and erect an asymmetrical roof clad in metal. The ridge would be lower than the adjoining properties and with the fully hipped roof, in angled street scene views, the addition would not be prominent and it would appear as a reasonably minor element within the overall variation that this row of buildings already exhibits.
  6. In views from the area in front of the dwelling, the asymmetrical roof would be apparent, but the form would still be pitched and the full hip would minimise the bulk of the addition. While the metal cladding to the roof would be a material not commonly found in the area, it would have a contemporary character that would not be at odds with the range of contemporary additions and alterations that can be found in proximity to the site. As the roof bulk would be more modest and recessive in appearance compared to adjoining buildings, I consider that the appearance of the roof form could be accommodated alongside the adjoining buildings and in the street scene without harm to the character of the area.
  7. The Council is also concerned with the central balcony at second floor level. This element would be, to a reasonable extent, set within the roof form and some other properties nearby have variations on such a feature, albeit not projecting in the same way because they are part of a gable. As the overall height and bulk of the proposed roof would be less than the adjoining properties, the balcony element, as part of the overall design of the roof, would not be a dominant or harmful feature of the dwelling once completed. It would be such that the completed building would not appear as an overtly three storey structure.
  8. Taking all these matters into account, I consider that the design and appearance of the building with the proposed roof would reflect the contemporary coastal appearance of buildings that forms part of the character of the area. It would thereby accord with the policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that development should be sympathetic to local character and maintain a strong sense of place.
  9. I also attach weight in favour of the design of the scheme, and in particular the hipped roof, on the basis that it seeks to address the impact of the strong winds that blow from the sea and up and over the cliff face. It is explained that the building was damaged by such winds in the past. Consequently, the design would accord with the Framework requirement that development should function well not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
  10. The scheme would not conflict with the general approach and guidance in the document Residential Extensions – A Design Guide for Householders (September 2008) (the Residential Design Guide) mainly because the scheme would have a less bulky roof than the approved proposal and, for the reasons explained above, the effect on the area would be acceptable.

11. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the area and thereby would meet with the requirements of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), the Residential Design Guide and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, that development through its scale, layout, character and appearance be designed to respect the site and its surroundings.

### **Conditions**

12. I have taken into account the conditions suggested by the Council and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the statutory time period and the approved plans is necessary in the interests of certainty.
13. The application form specifies the external materials as a standing seam metal roof, and the windows and doors as aluminium and/or uPVC. The Council has recommended a condition which requires matching materials, however, the roof material in particular would not match the rest of the building and the precise metal is not specified on the form. To ensure that there is certainty with the external materials, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is necessary for these external materials to be submitted to and be approved by the local planning authority prior to installation.

### **Conclusion**

14. Having regard to the above, and taking all other matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*David Wyborn*

INSPECTOR