



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2023

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/23/3314461

Flat 6 Faversham, 50 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth BH4 8BB

- 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 David Rolton against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2022-7657-P, dated 29 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is replacement of 2 x single doors to an existing garage with 1 x double door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of 2 x single doors to an existing garage with 1 x double door at Flat 6 Faversham, 50 West Cliff Road, Bournemouth BH4 8BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 7-2022-7657-P, dated 29 September 2022, 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 approved plans: Location Plan SZ0790NE; Site Plan TQRQM22252180523034 dated 09 September 2022; and Proposed Elevation Doc 004.
 - 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the proposed development shall be as specified on the application form and thereafter retained as such.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above is that given by the local planning authority. I have used this description as it more accurately describes the development proposed than that given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the significance of West Overcliff Drive Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a part of one of two garage blocks serving the flats forming No.50 West Cliff Road. The garage forming part of the appeal proposal is of a double size internally but accessed via two single doors separated by a brick pillar.
5. The garage block is accessed from, and faces towards, West Overcliff Drive. The garage is only visible from the public domain when directly facing the gated access, being screened from further views by existing boundary planting and the built form of No.50 West Cliff Road.
6. The site lies outside of the CA, the boundary to which runs down the western boundary to No.50 West Cliff Road and along its rear boundary with the road. The significance of the CA is derived from the sizable detached properties in large plots in a verdant setting, to which the appeal garage makes a neutral contribution. I am required to give special regard to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
7. At present, the pillars to the appeal garage are of different widths to those serving the other garages within the two blocks, with the centre pillar considerably narrower. As a result, the appeal site already deviates from the more consistent design and spacing of the other garages. In light of this, and given that two of the other white garage doors are of a different design disrupting further the consistent design, the removal of the centre pillar and provision of a double garage door would not unacceptably unbalance the garage blocks, result in a bulky appearance or detract from the wider area. Moreover, the appeal proposal would retain the existing walls and roof to the garage, replace two garage doors with a double door of a similar design, and been designed to aid accessibility and enhance disabled access.
8. Given that the existing garage can only be viewed from the access, and the proposal retains the existing boundary screening, the proposal would not appear prominent, intrusive or incongruous and would retain the verdant setting of the area and CA. This is the case even if the road is busier in summer months. Whilst the wider area comprises mainly single garages, there are larger garages present and as a result the proposal would not introduce an incongruous or harmful form of development.
9. I have considered the guidance in paragraph 3.5 of the Residential extensions, A Design Guide for Householders (September 2008) (DG). However, whilst this states that double garage doors can look unattractive with two single doors with mid and end piers viewed more favourably, this guidance does not preclude the provision of well-designed double garage doors that do not have a bulky appearance or negative impact.
10. Given the above, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and would preserve the significance of West Overcliff Drive Conservation Area. As a result, it would comply with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (October 2012) and the provisions of paragraph 3.5 of the DG. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure development is well-designed and of a high quality, designed to respect the site and its surroundings and ensure that garages are designed not to have a negative impact on the street. As a result, the proposal also complies with

the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in achieving well-designed places sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. I have limited information before me to demonstrate that the removal of the small central pillar would irreversibly damage the car park surface.
12. The plans and information submitted with the appeal adequately detail the proposal from a planning perspective and whether this is the appellant's main residence or not does not alter my findings above.
13. Concerns have been raised regarding the need for Building Regulations approval and lack of compliance with 'House Rules' and the host buildings lease. However, such matters fall outside of my remit.

Conditions

14. I have had regard to the tests in the Framework in relation to conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
15. The Council have suggested a condition to ensure that the materials used for the external surfaces match the existing materials as stated on the application form. I find this necessary and reasonable in the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the area but have amended the wording in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Rose

INSPECTOR