
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2018

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/B1225/D/17/3181847
25 Monmouth Road, Wareham BH20 4QF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sydney Crow against the decision of Purbeck District Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2017/0299, dated 17 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as “an increase to the width of the proposed extension, which has approval of 1.7m”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council amended the description of the proposed development to “erect single storey side and rear extension”. This is a more accurate reflection of the proposal as the previously approved extension has not been implemented.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling at the appeal site is a detached bungalow that occupies a corner plot close to the junction of Monmouth Road with Streche Road. The building is set back from the 2 road frontages behind a substantial garden. This existing arrangement compliments general spaciousness and suburban character of the area. This character is also complemented by the open recreation ground to the rear of the appeal site and because the hospital buildings within Streche Road are set back substantially from the road.
5. The proposal would extend across much of the width of the property behind boundary planting. It would also extend a long way to the rear of the property. I have not been provided with precise dimensions to accurately compare the 2 schemes but the proposal would be similar to that proposed in 2014 when my colleague dismissed an appeal¹ (the 2014 appeal). That appeal followed an earlier appeal considered in 2012.
6. The current proposal would not extend quite as far to the side or rear

¹ APP/B1225/D/14/2214124

boundaries of the property as was proposed in 2014 but it would have a similar impact. Due to the extent of the extension to the side and rear, there would be a substantial loss of space to the side which would be very noticeable at the junction. This would have a much greater impact than the wall and shed that currently occupy part of the garden but which take up significantly less space and are far less bulky than the proposal would be.

7. The extension to the bungalow already been approved by the Council on the appeal site would be substantially narrower than the current proposal. That alternative scheme would allow for much more space to be retained to the side thereby not having as great an impact as the proposal. A further material change of circumstances since the 2014 appeal is the extension to the side of the property opposite the appeal site at No 1 Monmouth Road. No 1 is in a comparable position with respect to the frontage of Monmouth Road and Streche Road. I have limited information about that case which the appellant has referred to. I could see that the bungalow has been extended to the side. A much greater amount of space has however been retained between the bungalow and Streche Road than is proposed in this case. Unlike the proposal this has had a very limited impact upon the spaciousness of the area.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This would not positively integrate with its surroundings thereby not complying with Policy D of the Local Plan² which is the same policy that applied in the 2014 appeal. As required by paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) I have attached great importance to the design of the built environment. The Council's Design Guide³ also requires the reinforcement of local distinctiveness and this would not be achieved.

Other Matters

9. The appellant urgently requires accommodation that facilitates wheelchair access to the outside. However, it has not been explained how the extension already approved by the Council would be deficient in this respect. The larger bedroom proposed would make internal circulation easier but again, it has not been explained whether this is critical to the provision of an accessible dwelling. I can give some limited weight to these personal circumstances however the harm that I have identified would be very noticeable and permanent. In reaching a conclusion in this case I have had due regard to my duties under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty. Taking these statutory duties into account, the limited weight I can give to the personal circumstances does not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

² Purbeck Local Plan Part 1, adopted November 2012

³ Purbeck District Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, 14 January 2014