



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/25/3367283

28 Haverstock Road, Bournemouth, BH9 3HE

- 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 Mr Nicholson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2025-27943-A.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension with lean-to structure. Introduction of new materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The development the subject of this appeal has been carried out and completed.

Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

4. 28 Haverstock Road is a two storey detached house in an established residential area. It has a single storey rear extension across the full width of the original house. I understand that there was previously a large outbuilding in the rear garden adjacent to the boundary with No. 26.
5. 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 and provide a high standard of amenity for residents.
6. The development the subject of this appeal includes a lean-to structure to the side, filling the gap between Nos. 28 and 26 and an enclosed flat roofed section finished externally in a dark metal cladding which extends towards the rear in line with the main rear extension. The Council raises no objections to the materials in terms of the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area and I see no reason to disagree with this view, in terms of the street scene.

7. The rear section of the development fills the gap between the rear extension and the side boundary with No. 26, apart from a small space adjacent to the side wall of No. 26, and extends to the same length as the earlier extension, approximately 4.8m from the main rear elevation.
8. I consider that this part of the development has an overbearing presence due to its length, flat roof, dark materials and proximity to the boundary. Its height above the boundary fence, although not in itself excessive, exacerbates its impact. It increases the sense of enclosure in that part of the garden of No. 26 immediately adjacent to the house and appears as a dominant and unsightly feature highly visible from there and from within the house. I note that there was previously a large outbuilding at No. 28 close to the boundary which was clearly visible from the rear of No. 26. However, on the basis of the information before me, it appears that this was further down the garden, in lighter coloured materials and less oppressive in appearance.
9. I conclude that the development has an overbearing impact on the outlook from No. 26 and is harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. In this respect the development is contrary to Core Strategy policy SC41.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR