



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2021

by Baljit K Muston BA(Hons) PGDip MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/21/3284834

16 Stevenson Road, Bournemouth BH6 4DB

- 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 D Spiers against the decision of BCP Council.
 - The application 7-2021-10110-F, dated 14 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is alterations, extensions and remodelling of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Revised plans were submitted with the appeal that would remove the first floor balcony from the front elevation of the dwelling. The revised plans do not materially alter the nature of the application and do not prejudice the interests of any parties. I have therefore taken them into consideration.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. An earlier scheme was refused planning permission by the Council and dismissed at appeal (APP/V1260/D/21/3269453) in April 2021. The Inspector in that case considered that, *"even though the height increase would be fairly modest, the additional bulk and the significant areas of glazing within the gable ends would give the house a three-storey appearance when approaching in either direction along Southbourne Coast Road"*. They concluded as a result that *"The dwelling, particularly given its highly prominent position, would therefore be unduly dominant in such views and harmful to the fairly low built form character of the street."*
5. When considering the impact on the street scene within Stevenson Road, the April 2021 Inspector felt that *"In light of the ridge height of No 12 Stevenson Road, the increased height would broadly be consistent with the neighbouring part of the Stevenson Road street scene"*. However, they went on to conclude on this elevation that *"the gable end roof would be incongruous given the*

characteristic hipped roof form of the properties, with No 12's front gable clearly appearing as a subordinate feature".

6. That Inspector also considered that the front balcony proposed would be incongruous, as balconies are not a characteristic feature of the front elevations of dwellings in Stevenson Road.
7. The current appeal proposal has amended the front elevation, by replacing the full width gable with a hipped roof, which is more characteristic of other dwellings in Stevenson Road, and inserting a gable within that hipped roof. The resulting gable would still be large; however it would now appear as a subservient feature within the front elevation, in the same way that the gable at No 12 does. The revised plans that also remove the front balcony would result in a form of development that would not look out of keeping, when seen alongside the other houses along Stevenson Road.
8. By contrast, the rear elevation would be largely unaltered from that considered by the previous Inspector. As a result, when approaching from the west along Southbourne Overcliff Drive, the additional bulk of the extended house, and the extensive areas of glazing, particularly within the rear elevation, would contrast markedly with the lower built form along this part of the Drive. I agree with the previous Inspector that it would appear unduly dominant in the street scene and be harmful to the predominant character of this part of Southbourne Overcliff Drive.
9. The appellant has submitted a Certificate of Lawfulness (CoL) application in respect of a proposed hip to gable extension to the rear of the existing house, and dormer windows to either side. This has not yet been determined by the Council. If it is approved, it would become a material consideration in this appeal. However, the weight that should be attached to it will depend on the likelihood of it going ahead.
10. The appellant has stated that he is "very likely" to implement this proposal if this appeal is dismissed. However, the various applications on this property have all sought extensions and alterations that would remodel and modernise the house, and provide views towards the sea. The CoL proposal would not do this, but would instead simply add living accommodation at roof level, which would include the rooms facing the sea having obscurely glazed windows. I am therefore not convinced that the likelihood of the CoL scheme being implemented is high, as it fails to achieve a lot of what the various planning applications have sought. I therefore attach only limited weight to it as a material consideration.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012), which requires developments to respect the site and its surroundings, in respect of, amongst other things, scale, character and appearance.

Other Matters

12. The owner and occupier of 14 Stevenson Road objected to the application, on grounds that included the effect on the character and appearance of the area. She also objected on the basis of the impact that the proposal would have on her living conditions. The April 2021 Inspector considered this issue at some

length in their decision, and concluded that the proposed development would not have an unacceptably harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 14 Stevenson Road. From the evidence before me, and from what I saw on my site visit, I see no reason to disagree with that assessment.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area outweighs other material considerations, including the submitted CoL application, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Baljit K Muston

INSPECTOR