



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by **Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3367181

35 Harbeck Road, Bournemouth, BH8 0AH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Zheng against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application ref is P/25/00676/HOU.
 - The development proposed is rear/side extension, roof alterations including addition of dormer to accommodate new first floor, internal & fenestration alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. 35 Harbeck Road is a detached bungalow located on the corner of Harbeck Road and Chesildene Drive. It occupies a long plot which extends to the rear/side along Chesildene Drive within which there is a garage and a large static caravan style structure. A high timber fence marks the boundary with Chesildene Drive and the footpath along the eastern side of the site. The surrounding area is characterised by a variety of dwellings, many of which are bungalows, some of which have been extended or altered in various ways including dormer windows.
4. The main policy relevant in this case is CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan Core Strategy, adopted 2012 (the Core Strategy), which relates to design and, among other things, requires development to respect the site and its surroundings through its scale, character and appearance.
5. I consider that the size, design and siting of the proposed extension would be out of keeping with the existing building itself and unsympathetic to the prevailing style and proportions of the surrounding dwellings. The increased height of the roof over the existing rear element and the introduction of a gable would result in a discordant feature in this prominent position on the street corner. Its impact would be further exacerbated by the proposed large flat roofed dormer with fenestration which would relate poorly to the pattern of fenestration on the ground floor.

6. I have taken account of the extension to 58 Broadway Lane which was permitted in 2019 in the context of the same development plan policy currently in effect. It is similar in many respects to the proposal, but in my view, the size and siting and the long horizontal emphasis of the flat roof dormer facing Chesildene Drive, together with the gable end, are wholly out of character with the prevailing pattern of steep roof forms which are characteristic of the area. It is an established planning principle that each case is determined on its merits, and I consider that this is not a suitable example to follow at the appeal site, particularly in view of its prominent location on a corner. If it were to be repeated in the area, I consider that the resultant cumulative effect would harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. I conclude that the proposal would fail to respect the scale, character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area, contrary to Core Strategy policy CS41.
8. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR