
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Lynne Evans BA MA MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P1235/W/19/3224356
56 Corporation Road, Weymouth DT4 0LJ

- 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 Pattison against the decision of Weymouth & Portland Borough Council (now Dorset Council).
 - The application Ref: WP/18/00185/FUL dated 5 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is 2 No. bedroom starter home adjacent to 56 Corporation Road, Weymouth.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 1 April 2019, Weymouth and Portland Borough Council became part of a single unitary authority, Dorset Council.
3. The description of development refers to a starter home but there is no further information before me to indicate that it would fall to be considered under the definition of a starter home as set out in the Glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in a predominantly residential area, with a regular pattern of well-spaced semi-detached dwellings, a small number of which have been extended to the side.
6. The proposal would add a two storey development to the side, almost to the existing side boundary and in place of the existing driveway, in order to create a new dwelling. It would therefore result in a terrace of three dwellings, but with the new dwelling being narrower in width than the existing two dwellings.
7. The introduction of a terrace of three dwellings would be a visually discordant feature in the street scene, giving the predominant pattern of regularly spaced, semi-detached dwellings. I have noted that a small number of two storey

extensions to existing dwellings, but most of these appear to be extensions to existing dwellings. The new dwelling would be narrower than most other dwellings in the surrounding area; it would have a fenestration pattern that would be different to the existing dwelling in terms of the size of window openings, together with its own front door, and subdivision of the garden to serve the two properties.

8. Notwithstanding the driveway to the adjoining property to the south, the new dwelling, given its narrower form which would extend almost to the side boundary, would appear cramped within its plot and out of keeping with the pattern of well-spaced dwellings in the locality. As a result, the new dwelling would appear as a discordant form of development in relation to the distinct and spacious character and appearance of the local area.
9. The Appellant has referred me to an example at No 2 Perth Street where a development was permitted by the Council, introducing a terrace of three dwellings. However, this property is on the corner with Abbotsbury Road where there is a more mixed character of development. It does not therefore persuade me to a different view in respect of the proposal before me, given its siting in relation to surrounding development.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the local area. It would conflict with Policies ENV10 and ENV12 of the adopted West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan as well as the National Planning Policy Framework and in particular Section 12, all of which seek a good quality of design which respects the local context.

Other Considerations and Planning Balance

11. The Council has acknowledged at the application stage that it cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Paragraph 11 of the Framework sets out that decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that, under criterion d) where the policies which are most important for determining the application are out of date, planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Given the lack of a five year housing land supply, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is engaged.
12. Whilst paragraph 57 of the Framework refers to the government's objective to boost significantly the supply of housing the provision of one additional unit would make little meaningful difference. When judged against some of the core planning principles the proposal would perform well in that it would be in an urban area where access to facilities is likely to be greatest. However, good design is also a key aspect of sustainable development.
13. In terms of its component dimensions there would be a small social benefit in providing an extra housing unit. Economic advantages would also arise from the construction and occupation of a new house. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the area identified would be significant and as a result the environmental role of sustainable development would not be achieved. When assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore, the proposal would not be a sustainable form of

development. The conflict with the development plan is not outweighed by other considerations including the Framework.

Conclusion

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

L J Evans

INSPECTOR