



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 June 2021

By Alison Fish BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/21/3271448

80 Woodlinken Drive, Verwood, Dorset BH31 6BW

- 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 & Mrs Cawte against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 3/20/2200/HOU, dated 4 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension including alterations to remodel the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension including alterations to remodel the existing dwelling at 80 Woodlinken Drive, Verwood, Dorset BH31 6BW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3/20/2200/HOU, dated 4 December 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2020-14-11 and 2020-14-12.
 - 3) No development above damp proof course level shall commence until details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions and alterations hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and samples.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by the appellants against Dorset Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i) The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area; and
 - ii) The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with respect to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is located in a residential area where there is a mix of property types with a predominance of bungalows interspersed by dormer bungalows and 2-storey dwellings. The dormer bungalows have a mix of flat roof and pitch roof dormers. The properties are generally set back from the road and interspersed with mature tree planting giving the area a sense of space.
5. The appeal dwelling is a detached 2-storey property with a flat roof dormer in a catslide roof to the side. It is located between another 2-storey dwelling and a bungalow. It is similar in style to the neighbouring dwelling although both properties have different cladding at first floor level and the appeal dwelling has mock shutters to its windows. The bungalow is constructed wholly of brick.
6. The proposed alterations to the host dwelling are undoubtedly modern in terms of their design and use of materials. The provision of a 2-storey, flat roof side extension, oriel windows and the use of charred timber cladding would result in a dwelling which is clearly in contrast to the appearance of the majority of existing development in the area. However, this does not mean that a modern design is inherently incongruous or that development proposals must replicate what has gone before. During my site visit I saw that a number of properties have been altered and changed over time to reflect more modern approaches to design with the introduction of contemporary elements such as vertical timber cladding and anthracite window frames and doors.
7. Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. There are common features in the local area which will not be affected by the proposal – the appeal property would still be set back within its plot, it would retain the main pitched roof with subservient flat roof element and retain the sense of space which I identified as key features of the character and appearance of the area.
8. As a result, I am satisfied that allowing this appeal will not detract from the local area but will add to the general mix of development in the area and the clear trend towards dwellings reflecting modern design preferences. Therefore it would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, I find that the proposal complies with policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy (LP) which seeks to ensure that development is compatible with or improves its surroundings, and paragraph 127 of the Framework.

Living Conditions of the Neighbouring Occupiers

9. The adjacent bungalow, 78 Woodlinken Drive, is detached and set slightly further back in its plot than the host dwelling. The side wall closest to the appeal property has no windows in it. The proposed porch and rear extension to the host dwelling are both single storey with a flat roof and as such, these elements would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of no 78.
10. The 2-storey element of the proposal is also flat roof. Its overall height would be below the ridge of the host dwelling but set up from its eaves, in the

location of the existing catslide roof. On my site visit, I noted that the garage is the closest part of the bungalow to the appeal proposal and that this, together with the lack of windows of the side elevation and the setting back of the bungalow further than the appeal proposal means that I do not consider that the proposed extension would result in a development which is overbearing or diminishes the light to such an extent that it would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the bungalow. Consequently, I find that the proposal complies with policy HE2 of the LP which seeks to ensure development is compatible with nearby properties and minimises disturbance to amenity.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition requiring the external materials to be used in the construction of the proposal to be agreed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Alison Fish

INSPECTOR