

**WESTERN PLANNING COMMITTEE 2nd APRIL
2026 / EASTERN PLANNING COMMITTEE 16th
APRIL 2026**



Report subject	Appeals Report
Meeting dates	2 nd April 2026 & 16 th April 2026
Status	Public Report
Executive summary	This report updates members of the planning committee on the Local Planning authority's Appeal performance over the stated period
Recommendations	It is RECOMMENDED that: The planning committee notes the contents of this report.
Reason for recommendations	The content of this report is for information only.

Portfolio Holder(s):	Councillor Millie Earl, Leader of the Council and Chair of Cabinet.
Corporate Director	Glynn Barton, Chief Operations Officer
Report Authors	Katie Herrington and Simon Gould, Development Management Managers
Wards	Not applicable
Classification	For Information

Background

1. The purpose of this report is to feedback to members on planning appeal decisions determined by the Planning Inspectorate for the last 2 years. This includes a reflection and highlight of any key decisions or learnings arising from such decisions.
2. The fundamental purpose of this report is to provide transparency in the appeal performance of the planning service and to improve the quality of decision making where necessary.

Appeals Performance

3. National Government monitors the 'quality' of decision making in planning through appeal performance. It is measured by the percentage of planning decisions overturned at appeal, with a lower percentage indicative of better-quality decision making as less appeals are allowed.
4. Government targets are currently a maximum of 10% of the authorities total number of decisions on applications being made during the assessment period being overturned at appeal. This is set over an assessment period of 2 years, comprising October 2022 to September 2024¹. This includes non-majors and majors'.
5. As demonstrated by Figure 1 for major applications and Figure 2 for non-major applications, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is performing within target for the Quality of Planning decisions. Note that the dataset has now been updated to September.

¹ [Improving planning performance: criteria for designation \(updated 2024\) - GOV.UK](#)

Proxy assessment period January 2023 –December 2024²	Total number of major application decisions³	Major decisions overturned at appeal	Quality of decisions (% overturned at appeal)	England Average (% overturned at appeal)
Total District Matters ⁴ (PS2)	196	4	2.0	3
Total County Matters ⁵ (SPS2)	0	0	0	0.6

Figure 1 Quality of major application decisions - taken from National Statistics Table P152 ([Live tables on planning application statistics - GOV.UK](#))

Assessment period January 2023-December 2024	Total number of non-major application decisions	Total number of decisions overturned at appeal	Quality of decisions (% overturned at appeal).	England Average (% overturn at appeal)
Total District Matters (PS2)	4,615	86	1.9	1.1

Figure 2 Quality of non-major application decisions - taken from National Statistics Table P154 - [Live tables on planning application statistics - GOV.UK](#)

6. Figure 3 provides a breakdown of appeal performance measured against appeals dismissed or allowed. It demonstrates that on average 35% of appeals are allowed.

Year: 2025 - 2026	Dismissed	Allowed	Total	% overturned	NFA/ Withdrawn
March	18	7	25	28%	0
April	8	10	18	55%	0
May	7	5	12	42%	0
June	7	5	12	42%	0
July	10	1	11	9%	0
August	7	0	8	0%	1
September	6	1	0	15%	0
October	15	2	17	11%	0
November	8	5	13	38%	1
December	5	6	11	54%	0
January	3	0	3	0%	0
February	3	2	5	40%	0
Total					0

² This period is proxy as it falls outside of the 'assessment period' as per the 'criteria for designation', the data in the table is updated on a quarterly basis, with the period to June 24 being published in June 25

³ This dataset excludes Appeals relating to planning conditions.

⁴ District Matters' comprise most applications, explicitly excluding 'County Matters'.

⁵ County Matters' applications refer to planning applications related to minerals, waste and associated development.

7. Whilst the LPA is performing within target for the national measure for the 'quality of decision making', it is still necessary to review and reflect on appeal decisions in order to provide high quality decisions, and to avoid the potential for successful cost claims. In August no appeals were allowed, with one appeal being declared as 'invalid' by the Inspector. This was because of the absence of the required BNG information.

General reflection on allowed appeals

8. Whilst the LPA is performing within target for the national measure for the 'quality of decision making', it is still necessary to review and reflect on appeal decisions in order to provide high quality decisions, and to avoid the potential for successful cost claims. Figure 4 below sets out a short summary of why the appeals in the month of June were allowed.

Allowed appeals

address	9 Mountbatten Road, Poole
Proposal	to extend and alter the existing building and sever the plot to create two houses with associated parking.
Committee overturn	No
Main issues	Impact upon the character and appearance of the area, including Conservation Area.
Why allowed	Whilst subdivision would be obvious from street scene, existing garden already has degree of physical subdivision due to the large shed, boundary wall and gate. Existing boundary treatments line the amenity areas, making them largely imperceptible from wider areas – not undermining spacious character of the area. As a result, the Inspector concluded that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and Cons area.

address	156 Barrack Road, Christchurch
Proposal	Variation of condition to remove / amend the condition requirements from grant of an internally illuminated advertisement;
Committee overturn	No
Main issues	Impact upon amenity and highway safety
Why allowed	The Inspector considered that the removal of the hours of operation part of condition 2 would result in adverse harm and did not allow this change. However, the Inspector found the illuminance restriction imposed to be unnecessarily restrictive, and found no justification to restrict this as such

	on highway safety grounds, and imposed a less stringent requirement. The Inspector also considered the condition requirement to assess illumination post development to be unnecessary, on the basis that the council would be able to pursue this through their own enforcement powers.
--	--

address	Dorwin Court, 328 Poole Road & 68 Princess Road, Poole
Proposal	Alteration and upward extension of the buildings to create second and third floors of accommodation on each building to create 10 additional apartments in each block (20 in total).
Committee overturn	Yes
Main issues	the character and appearance of the area the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regards to overshadowing
Why allowed	The Inspector considered that the extensions would 'would reflect the architectural style of the lower floors including the distinctive fenestration and white render finish', and concluded that there would be no harm to the "art-deco" style of the current buildings. The Inspector considered that buildings of similar scale to the proposed development currently exist on either side of the appeal site, and the development would sit below the roofline of these buildings. The Inspector also stated that 'it is difficult to understand how the Council came to the view that the scale, mass, bulk and height of the appeal scheme would be excessive... insofar as they seek that development that <i>"reflects"</i>, <i>"is consistent"</i> and <i>"in keeping with"</i> neighbouring buildings.' In terms of living conditions, the Inspector noted that in built up areas a degree of encroachment into views and outlook is expected, and therefore a change in outlook is not necessarily harmful The Inspector stated that 'it is difficult to see how there could be an unacceptable impact on neighbouring occupiers' given that the proposal would not exceed the height of its neighbouring blocks, and would not encroach on the '45 degree' from the neighbouring windows. The Inspector also agreed with the Case Officers assessment that 'the orientation of Eaglehurst to the appeal buildings is such that increased overshadowing would be limited to the latter part of the day and would not be significant or unacceptable in planning terms'. The Inspector also agreed with the Officers interpretation of Policy PP12

	regarding the accessibility of the building – in that it would not be necessary or reasonable to require compliance with M4(2) of the Building regulations – ‘accessible and adaptable dwellings’.
--	--

List of live appeals

Appendix 1 provides a list of current appeals.

Options Appraisal

9. No options to consider.

Summary of financial implications

10. There are no financial implications as a direct result of this report.
11. However, it should be reminded that the Council can be subject to ‘costs’⁶ if the Council were found to be behaving ‘unreasonably’. Such ‘unreasonable’ behaviour includes procedural (relating to the process) and substantive (relating to the issues arising from the merits of the appeal) matters. Examples of unreasonable behaviour include⁷;
 - a. ‘preventing or delaying development which should clearly be permitted, having regard to its accordance with the development plan, national policy and any other material considerations’
 - b. not determining similar cases in a consistent manner
 - c. imposing a condition that is not necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise and reasonable in all other respects, and thus does not comply with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework on planning conditions and obligation.
 - d. vague, generalised or inaccurate assertions about a proposal’s impact, which are unsupported by any objective analysis

Summary of legal implications

12. None in directly relation to the content of this report.
13. However, it should be reminded that the Council can be subject to Judicial Review. A Judicial Review is a mechanism for challenging the process of a decision, rather than the decision itself. An example of this is acting contrary to procedure. However such procedure can come with financial penalties.

Summary of human resources implications

14. There are no direct human resource implications resulting from this report. However, it is reminded that the servicing of appeals can be resource heavy, particularly at a hearing or Public Inquiry.

⁶ [Claim planning appeal costs: Overview - GOV.UK](#)

⁷ [Appeals - GOV.UK](#)

Summary of sustainability impact

15. There are no sustainability issues arising from this report.

Summary of public health implications

16. There are no public health implications arising from this report. Summary of equality implications

Summary of risk assessment

17. Any risks associated with any appeal decisions are discussed in the body of the report. No risks have been identified in this report.

Background papers

Published appeal statistics and appeal decisions

Criteria Document 2024

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/674f2ec08b522bba9d991af9/Criteria Document 2024.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/674f2ec08b522bba9d991af9/Criteria_Document_2024.pdf)

Live Planning Statistics tables - [Live tables on planning application statistics - GOV.UK](#)

Appendices

Appendix 1 – list of outstanding appeals.