



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by Simon J Cater MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3370720

3 The Moorings, 2 Willow Way, Christchurch, Dorset BH23 1JJ

- 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 Paul Cripps against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/00748/HOU.
 - The development is enlargement of existing ground floor balcony
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for enlargement of existing ground floor balcony at 3 The Moorings, 2 Willow Way, Christchurch, Dorset BH23 1JJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. P/25/00748/HOU, 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: DWG No. 24013.CRI01.200.R01 (Block and Location Plans), DWG No. 24013.CRI01.203.R02 (Proposed Plans & Elevations), DWG No. 24013.CRI01.204.R02 (Proposed Plans) and DWG No. 24013.CRI01.205.R01 (Proposed Site Plan)

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed balcony extension on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to overlooking and loss of privacy.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to a mid-terrace dwelling within a riverside development of similar properties. The proposal involves the enlargement of an existing ground floor balcony and the installation of clear glazed balustrading
4. The houses are built close together along the River Stour, with their backs and balconies looking out over the water. As a result, a degree of mutual overlooking is inherent to the layout and character of the development.
5. The Council's concern relates to the omission of an obscure glazed privacy screen on the eastern elevation of the balcony, which formed part of a previously approved

scheme¹. It is suggested that the absence of such screening would result in a harmful loss of privacy and overlooking to the occupants of No. 4.

6. The proposed development would result in a modest increase in the depth of the balcony and the installation of clear glazed balustrading on all sides, including the eastern elevation. The previously approved obscure glazed screen has been omitted.
7. While the extension would marginally increase the area from which views into No. 4 can be obtained, the relationship between the appeal property and No. 4 is already characterised by mutual overlooking. From my site visit, it was evident that views between neighbouring properties are already achievable from existing balconies and rear windows.
8. The proposed changes would not introduce new or materially different sightlines, and the additional depth would not materially alter the relationship between No. 3 and No. 4. The use of clear glazing would maintain visual permeability across the rear elevation and preserve the architectural coherence of the terrace.
9. The appellant has drawn attention to similar balcony treatments at Nos. 1, 2 and 5, which incorporate clear glazed balustrading and have been implemented without obscure screening. The proposed design reflects this established pattern and is supported by the residents' management committee, who seek to maintain a consistent approach to balcony refurbishment across the development.
10. There is no objection from neighbouring residents including No. 4. The proposal would maintain the visual coherence of the rear elevations and preserve views across the river, which contribute to the character and amenity of the area.
11. In this context, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or harm to residential amenity.
12. The appeal proposal accords with Policies HE2 and KS1 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan (2014), which seek high-quality design that respects local distinctiveness and promotes sustainable development, and with saved Policy H12 of the Borough of Christchurch Local Plan (2001), which safeguards residential amenity from unacceptable loss of privacy.

Conditions

13. In imposing the conditions, I have had regard to the tests for planning conditions in paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the guidance in the Planning Practice Guidance. In this respect there is a need for a condition listing the plans to which the proposal should accord, in the interests of certainty.
14. The Council suggested a condition requiring the materials in the construction of the external surfaces shall match those used in the existing building. However, this requirement is already secured through the approved plans, which clearly specify the materials to be used. As the condition would simply duplicate information already controlled by the approved drawings, I do not consider it necessary to include it in the decision.

¹ Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole, Planning Application Ref. 8/24/0431/HOU

15. A condition requiring the installation of a 1.8m high privacy screen along the eastern boundary has been suggested by the Council. However, I do not consider such a condition to be necessary. The proposed development would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy or materially worsen the existing relationship between No. 3 and No. 4 The Moorings. The degree of mutual overlooking is already established within the layout of the terrace, and the modest increase in balcony depth does not introduce new or intrusive sightlines. As such, the imposition of a condition requiring a privacy screen would not meet the tests of necessity or reasonableness, and I find no harm that would justify its inclusion.

Conclusion

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

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR