
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2026

by **H Faulkner BSc (Hons) MSc PGCE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/W/25/3371438

20 Wilverley Avenue, Bournemouth, BH8 0HT

- 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 and Mrs Thompson-Williams against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 7-2024-26646-A.
 - The development proposed is use of existing attached annexe as holiday let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character of the area including associated noise and disturbance; and
 - whether the proposed development would provide suitable living conditions for future occupiers.

Reasons

Character, Noise and Disturbance

3. The proposed holiday let is to the rear of a terrace property in a predominantly residential area. The host property and its neighbours are modest in size with relatively small gardens.
4. The extension to No. 41 Wilverley Avenue occupies a substantial proportion of the rear garden, and I am not aware of any extensions of a comparable scale in the immediate vicinity. While the proposal would not alter the external appearance of the building, it would materially change the way in which it is used.
5. As an annexe, the extension was used in connection with the main house, resulting in shared activities between the occupiers. For example, the existing plans indicate shared access and a shared kitchen.
6. The proposed use would be accessed via the shared alleyway between the appeal property and its attached neighbour, running beneath the first floor. Accessing independent accommodation in this way is uncommon in the area. As this would be the sole entrance to the holiday unit, the intensity of its use is likely to be greater than that associated with the dwelling alone. Given the transient nature of holiday

- occupants, a notable level of comings and goings can also be expected, even if a condition were imposed requiring a minimum number of nights per stay.
7. The use of the building as a holiday let would also include the garden. While holidaymakers may make greater use of the outdoor space, I do not consider that the resulting noise and disturbance would be significantly greater than that generated by the occupants of the main house using the garden.
 8. Notwithstanding my conclusions regarding the garden, the use of the annexe as a holiday let would intensify activity on a small site served by a narrow and constrained access in close proximity to neighbouring properties. This increased level of disturbance would be out of keeping with the character of the wider residential area.
 9. I have been provided with other examples of holiday lets being approved within the area. However, I do not find any of these to be comparable in terms of the access and the relationship with neighbouring properties.
 10. Restrictions have been suggested in respect of the use of the holiday let which could limit the number of occupiers, the use of the external space and fencing. Even if these could be conditioned, it would not alter the fundamental concerns in respect of the increased intensity of the use of the site and the effect on the area's character.
 11. Overall, the proposal would adversely affect the character of the area and create a more intensive use of the site, resulting in greater disturbance. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS41 of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (BLP), which requires new development and changes of use to enhance local character, distinctiveness, and residential amenity. It would also be contrary to Policy CS38 of the BLP, which seeks to safeguard residents from noise disturbance.

Living Conditions

12. The proposed holiday let consists of an en suite bedroom and a living room with a kitchen, there is also access to the garden area. The floor area of the accommodation would be in the region of 25m² which is below the Technical housing standards – nationally described space standards for a 1-bedroom 1-person dwelling.
13. Although the accommodation would fall below national space standards, these are not directly applicable to holiday accommodation. The space provided would be adequate for short-term occupation, as requirements such as storage are less critical for this type of use. The unit would also be larger and better equipped than some hotel rooms, for example, and the availability of outdoor space would provide an additional benefit.
14. A condition would be needed to ensure that the annexe could only be used as holiday accommodation as the space would not be sufficient for longer term independent occupation.
15. Therefore, there is no conflict with Policy CS41 of the BLP which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that new developments enhance the amenities of future occupiers.

Other Matters

16. The site is located within 5km of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area (SPA), the Dorset Heathlands Ramsar Site, and the Dorset Heathlands Special Area of Conservation (SAC). It also lies within 13.8km from the New Forest SAC, New Forest SPA and New Forest Ramsar. Regulation 63(1) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 indicates that the requirement for an Appropriate Assessment is only necessary where the competent authority is minded to give consent for the proposed development. Whilst no financial obligation has been provided to secure any mitigation, given my overall conclusion on the first main issue, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter in any further detail.
17. The reason for refusal refers to Policy CS28 of the BLP. Although the title of this policy relates to tourist accommodation, its wording applies specifically to new hotels and guest houses, and therefore it is not applicable to the proposal in this case.
18. The benefits of the proposal to tourism, employment and the economy are acknowledged. However, given the size of the proposal I can only give this limited weight which does not outweigh the harm identified above.
19. The letters submitted both in support of and in objection to the development have been taken into account. While some residents may not consider themselves to be disturbed by the use, I have assessed the proposal against the relevant local policy, which requires consideration of the character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

20. Although I have identified no harm to the living conditions of future occupiers resulting from the proposed holiday let use, the development would nevertheless have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area, including through increased disturbance. There are no other material considerations to outweigh this finding or the conflict with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

H Faulkner

INSPECTOR

