



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3341787

8 Bankside Road, Bournemouth, Dorset, BH9 3EF.

- 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 and Mrs N Pavlou against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2023-25649-C, dated 17 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is replacement roof with dormers to provide additional bedroom and ensuite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 8 Bankside Road, is a detached two-storey dwelling, dating from the inter war year period. It is one of a number of what were, when built identical houses with similar shallow pitched hipped roofs.
4. As I observed there have over the years been any number of alterations to the dwellings in terms of replacement windows, replacement porches, recladding of bay windows, garage additions and no doubt, as in this case rear additions. However, the hipped roofs have generally been retained unaltered, save for the insertion of some rooflights set into side roof slopes.
5. The appellants propose the replacement of the roof. This would result in an increased ridge height of about 1.0 metre, a steeper pitch and the formation of a large rear gable. In addition, one flat roofed box dormer is proposed to either side roof slope along with a new rooflight in the roof slope facing the street.
6. The Council raise no objection to the proposed roof light in the front roof slope. From what I have seen and read I would not disagree with its findings on this point.
7. The proposed change to the height of the ridge would result in a noticeably taller roof and steeper pitch, even if only some 5 degrees as submitted in

- evidence, in comparison to the neighbouring properties. These changes would, in my judgement, despite some reported minor differences in existing ridge heights make number 8 appear both prominent and incongruous in the street scene.
8. The two large box dormers, not helped by one being completely blank, would appear as uncharacteristic, bulky and overly dominant additions. They would further denude the scale, form and profile of this roof in the context of the existing street scene, comprising simple well-mannered hipped roofs to the houses.
 9. My attention has been drawn to similar roof alterations to that proposed here in respect of houses in Winston Road, Homeside Road and Redbreast Road. Whatever the background to those cases, the existence of large and unattractive additions elsewhere on a nearby sites is not an appropriate justification for permitting another here, which I have considered on its individual planning merits.
 10. I conclude in respect of the main issue to be the proposed alterations would cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character of the area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local plan: Core Strategy (October 2012), the provisions of 3.3 of the Council's Residential Extensions: A Design Guide for Householders-PGN (2008) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) as they relate to, amongst other things, the requirement for high quality design and the need for development to contribute positively to the public realm.

Other Matters

11. I understand from the evidence that a Certificate of Lawfulness was granted under reference 7-20243-25649-B for two box dormers one to either side of the existing roof and a roof light in both the front and rear roof slopes. Further, the appellants suggest that a gable to the rear elevation could be constructed under permitted development rights, provided the ridge height of the existing roof is not exceeded. I appreciate that a development undertaken under these considerations may well represent a fallback position. However, these proposals would at least result in the ridge height and pitch of the roof remaining unaltered. Resulting in less harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. I have therefore given this consideration limited weight in my deliberations.
12. I note that the Council found that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. Further, I understand that both parking and access are considered appropriate. However, the absence of harm is a neutral factor in my considerations and, as such, I have given these matters very little weight in reaching my decision.
13. I appreciate that the design reflects the need for the development to comply with current Building Regulations. I also note that the proposed dormer to the south-east elevation does not require a window because it is simply required to provide internal head room. Notwithstanding these practical considerations I can only give them very limited weight in my consideration of the the overall design and its impact on the host property and the character and appearance of the area.

14. The appellants have drawn to my attention concerns relating to various matters relating to the original application for planning permission. These are however not relevant to my consideration of the planning merits of this appeal.

Conclusions

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

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR