



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 July 2021

by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3275732

2 Southville Road, Bournemouth, BH5 2JT

- 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 L Hills against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2021-27983, dated 16 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the formation of mansard roof with rooflights to dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have amended the original description of development to reflect that as stated at section E of the appeal form and as provided for on the Council's decision notice, in the interests of accuracy and consistency.
3. I have noted the discrepancies within the plans which accompanied the planning application and as described within the Appellant's statement of case. I noted the correct position of openings on my site visit and have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. Although the Council has given a single reason for refusal on the decision notice, having reviewed the evidence and submissions I have considered it appropriate to identify two main issues.
5. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host building; and,
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of nearby residents with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal building is a detached two storey dwelling with a front projecting gable and bay windows under a hipped roof form, located towards the southern

end of Southville Road. The hipped roof at the appeal building, due to its proportions and design, has an unassuming appearance.

7. Although there is commercial development located within the nearby Seabourne Road, Southville Road is residential in character and appearance. The residential houses in the general vicinity of the appeal site are of a variety of scales and exhibit some variety in terms of roof form. The houses within Southville Road are mainly characterised by well-proportioned detached and semi-detached dwellings, which predominately incorporate hipped roof forms. At the date of my visit, there were few examples within the immediate vicinity of gabled roof forms and dormer extensions. Where alteration has taken place to the roofs of residential properties within the immediate vicinity, it has generally been achieved sensitively and modestly.
8. It is proposed to replace the existing hipped roof form with a mansard style roof, with the front projecting gable and the two storey bay windows at the appeal building being retained. Whilst I acknowledge that there is a progression in height of dwellings within Southville Road as it rises uphill towards Seabourne Road and that the proposal would not increase the overall height of the roof, the appeal scheme would result in the roof pitch being increased significantly to a near vertical alignment, and would result in a dwelling that would somewhat dominate its surroundings in terms of appearance.
9. Furthermore, the bulk of the flat roof with its strong vertical alignment, whilst reflecting some examples of roof forms to be found on those mixed residential and commercial developments located within Seabourne Road, would, in my view, result in a dwelling that appeared to be top heavy and unbalanced, appearing to be at significant odds with the well proportioned host building and would be a visually discordant and dominant feature within the street scene being harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal building and would be harmful to the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, the appeal scheme would conflict with those parts of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy (2012) (the Core Strategy) which seeks to ensure high quality design which respects the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.
11. For the same reasons, the proposal would also be contrary to those paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework, which places a clear emphasis on achieving well designed places and good design. The appeal scheme would also fail to accord with the principles set out in the Bournemouth Borough Council's Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders (2008).

Living Conditions

12. In addition to the above requirements, Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy further provides that the Council will ensure that new development enhances the amenities of future occupants and neighbouring residents. In this regard, the Council maintains that the proposed mansard roof form would have an adverse impact on the living conditions of neighbouring residents at 4 Southville Road.
13. Whilst noting the above matters concerning the design of the proposed new roof form, the appeal property is positioned in very close proximity to its

neighbour at 4 Southville Road. The rear of the neighbouring dwelling extends beyond the building line for the rear of the appeal building, with the rear projection of the neighbouring dwelling being set back from the boundary with the pathway which provides access to a dwelling located to the rear of the appeal property and its neighbour.

14. The appeal scheme would not result in unacceptable living conditions for neighbouring residents in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy. Furthermore, in light of the existing position regarding the close proximity of the respective dwellings and by reason of the limited openings which face the appeal building, I find that the proposed mansard roof would not significantly alter the existing position with regards to outlook and consequently, in my view, the appeal scheme would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of residents at 4 Southville Road. In this respect, the proposal would comply with those parts of Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy which concern the amenities of future occupants and neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

15. Further to the above matters, interested parties raise an additional objection to the proposal on the grounds of land stability. This is an important matter and I have considered all the submissions before me. However, given my findings in relation to the main issues above, this is not a matter that has been critical to my overall decision.

Conclusion

16. The appeal proposal would not have a harmful effect with regards to the living conditions of residents at 4 Southville Road. However, the appeal scheme would represent a discordant and visually dominant building being harmful to the character and appearance of both the host building and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole, to which I attach significant weight in the determination of this appeal. The benefit of providing additional accommodation at the site would not outweigh the significant weight to be given with the conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
17. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR