



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2025

by **Simon J Cater MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3369777

1 York Close, Christchurch BH23 2DB

- 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 Ms Lizi Hutchinson against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/00635/HOU.
 - The development is demolition of garage and construction of replacement garage in the same location on the site. Erection of new timber fencing to adjacent rear gardens footpath.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development provided on the application form has superfluous phrasing. I have therefore adopted the wording from the Council's decision notice, omitting the term "retrospective" from the banner heading as this is not a description of development. I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans, which show demolition of garage and construction of replacement garage in the same location on the site. Erection of new timber fencing to adjacent rear gardens footpath.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed materials on the character and appearance of the area
 - whether the proposed materials used cause harm to the residential amenity of nearby occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal relates to the erection of a replacement garage and timber fencing at No. 1 York Close, Christchurch. The site lies within a residential area characterised by modest dwellings and flatted development, with a consistent use of brick and render finishes. Ancillary structures, including garages, are typically constructed from brick with tiled roofs, contributing to a restrained and coherent material palette.

5. I understand that the previous garage at the site was in an unsafe and deteriorated condition, constructed from part-timber and asbestos panelling. However, the use of colour-coated steel cladding and profiled metal roofing introduces an industrial appearance that is not reflective of the established character of York Close.
6. The appellant refers to nearby buildings featuring varied materials, including cladding, and a commercial building. However, these examples differ in context. The commercial building lies within a commercial setting, whereas York Close retains a distinctly residential character. While some examples include metal garage doors, these are limited, functional elements within otherwise conventional brick-built structures with tiled or pitched roofs. They do not extend across the full external envelope and are visually recessive, consistent with domestic garage typologies.
7. In contrast, the appeal proposal uses colour-coated steel cladding and profiled metal roofing across the entire structure, resulting in an industrialised appearance. None of the cited examples involve full metal cladding and therefore do not establish a precedent. The materials used in the appeal scheme appear incongruous alongside the prevailing brick and render finishes, causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area. The development conflicts with Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (2014) and the guidance set out in the Residential Extensions Design Guide (2008). Collectively, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings, reflects local distinctiveness, and uses materials that respect the established character of the area.

Residential Amenity

9. The garage is larger than a typical domestic garage. However, its siting within the rear garden, together with existing boundary treatments and the separation from neighbouring dwellings, limits its impact. While the structure is assertive in form, it does not appear unduly overbearing or oppressive in the context of the surrounding residential environment. There is no material loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties, and the siting and separation from neighbouring dwellings help to limit its impact.
10. Whilst the officer's report refers to the garage as a "visually dominant feature" and draws on guidance within the Residential Extensions Design Guide, which I understand, advises that large roof forms may appear overbearing or oppressive, I am not persuaded on the evidence before me that the structure results in a loss of amenity sufficient to amount to material harm. From publicly accessible vantage points, the garage is visible within the street scene, but its presence is not so intrusive as to unacceptably affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
11. Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan requires development to be compatible with or improve its surroundings, including in its relationship to nearby properties and the minimisation of general disturbance to amenity. Having regard to the siting, scale, and use of the garage, I am satisfied that the development does not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The scheme therefore accords with Policy HE2, the Residential Extensions Design Guide (2008).

Other Matters

12. Concern has been raised by a local resident regarding noise and the alleged use of the garage for commercial purposes. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to suggest that the garage is being used in a manner inconsistent with its domestic function, or that any activities undertaken therein give rise to unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance.
13. The officer's report records that two representations were received in support of the development. However, no further detail is provided, and in the absence of any substantive planning context, I afford these comments limited weight.

Conclusion

14. The garage for which permission is sought replaced a dilapidated garage constructed in part from asbestos. There is local support for the development, and it is not disputed that the previous garage was in poor condition and needed to be removed. Nonetheless, these considerations do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations to lead me to find otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Simon J Cater

INSPECTOR