



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020

by M Bale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/19/3238495

Sunnyside, Martins Lane, Milton On Stour SP8 5AD

- 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 Edgar Hunt against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 2/2019/0627/FUL, dated 15 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 25 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is agricultural barn to store hay, tractor and overflow for farm opposite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. Work has been commenced on site and the frame for a building has been erected. It is unclear whether the frame is in the location of the building shown on the plans. For this reason, and as the building is not complete, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is within a gently undulating landscape. When viewed from the road past the site, the land rises behind the appeal site and the adjoining dwelling, Sunnyside. A roadside hedge means that the building would be partially obscured in views from the road. The proposed timber clad external appearance would result in a mellow appearance, and existing and additional native planting would further reduce the visual impact.
5. Nevertheless, whilst there is a farm opposite, there are limited buildings on the site side of the road. The proposal would add built form into this relatively undeveloped landscape which would cause some harm to its character and appearance. Policy 4 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 (LP) seeks to protect landscape character and LP Policy 24 seeks to ensure that development is designed to improve the character and quality of the area. Whilst limited by the landscaping, the harm would bring the proposal into conflict with these policies.
6. To protect the countryside from unnecessary development, LP Policy 20 places a general restriction on development outside defined settlement boundaries.

Other than development that is clearly allowed in the countryside under certain other development plan policies, Policy 20 only permits development where it can be demonstrated that there is an overriding need for it to be so located. The supporting text, at LP paragraph 8.188 indicates that certain types of agricultural development may be appropriate.

7. The appellant has indicated that the building is required to house machinery and store hay. However, the associated land, shown on the drawings, is small and there is no clear evidence to counter the Council's suggestion that the proposed building is larger than required. The application form indicates that the building would provide overflow for the farm opposite, but there is no substantive evidence as to why this is required at this site. I, therefore, find that there is no demonstrable overriding need for the building and the proposal conflicts with LP Policy 20.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Bale

INSPECTOR