



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2023

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/22/3310235

127 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 De Kment against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole (BCP) Council.
 - The application Ref: 7-2022-25326-K dated 30 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is to raise the ridge height by 2 metres to create a gymnasium above the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a residential dwelling which fronts Southbourne Overcliff Drive with rear access via Bolton Road to an existing irregular shaped garage, reflecting the irregular shape of the plot at this northern end. It is set within a predominantly residential area with a wide variety of building forms and styles in the local area, including along Bolton Road. From Bolton Road, views can be obtained of part of the rear of the properties in Southbourne Overcliff Drive with a range of ancillary garages and outbuildings at the end of Bolton Road and extending into Bolton Close. There is, in my view, a clear visual divide between the residential properties in Bolton Road and the generally smaller and more modest ancillary outbuildings and garages, serving and relating to the properties in Southbourne Overcliff Drive.
4. The proposal would seek to build a first floor under a pitched roof over the existing garage. This would involve increasing the ridge of the garage by approximately 2 m. Because of the change in levels it would appear as two storeys at the front facing onto Bolton Road and an elevated single storey at the rear.
5. I have taken into account the information provided relating to the height of the proposal in the context of the two bungalows closest to it in Bolton Road. The attached sections demonstrate that the proposal would be lower than these

bungalows. Nonetheless the additional bulk and massing with the first floor addition would result in the proposed building becoming more visually prominent in the street scene.

6. I agree that the proposal would remain ancillary to the main dwelling fronting Southbourne Overcliff Drive. However, the proposed additional height and massing would be very apparent in views along Bolton Road, and from Belle Vue Road. In these views, and particularly along Bolton Road, the proposal would not relate in scale or form with the other ancillary garages and outbuildings serving the properties in Southbourne Overcliff Drive. It would be visually over-dominant and would appear visually incongruous in relation to the properties in Bolton Road. I therefore consider that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area.
7. The front elevation would include a glazed double door with a Juliette balcony under a glazed gable above. These design features would further emphasise its over dominating presence in the street scene. In his appeal submission, the Appellant has offered to revise the windows to Velux windows, but no detailed proposals are before me. Furthermore, any proposed changes would need to be the subject of further consultation and consideration and I am therefore unable to take this proposal into account in my decision.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. This would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy, the Council's Residential Development Design Guide for Householders, and the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which amongst other matters seek a high quality of design that respects the local context.
9. Both the Council and the Appellant have referred to a 2017 appeal decision which refused permission for a garage with room in the roof under Ref: APP/G1250/D/17/3181350. That decision has not been provided to me nor the details of that scheme but from the limited information provided, including quotes from that appeal decision, the principal issue related to the impact of the scheme on the character and appearance of the local area. My decision is based solely on the planning merits of the scheme before me, but I have also concluded that the proposed scheme would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the local area. Furthermore, the Council has indicated, and the Appellant has not disputed, that the earlier proposal would have resulted in a smaller increase in the overall height of 0.7m, compared with the proposal before me.

Other Considerations

10. A number of concerns have been raised about the relationship with neighbouring properties and the impact on the living conditions of neighbours. However, given the siting and distance to surrounding properties I do not consider that there would be a material concern in this regard. The Council also raised no objections in this regard.
11. The Appellant has referred to the Council's SPD – Residential Extensions. A guide for householders 2008 and the need for outdoor private space. However, the proposal before me relates to additional indoor private space and would not affect the outdoor private space at the property.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, including in representations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J Evans

INSPECTOR