



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2022

by Jonathan Manning BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/22/3290828

33 Moneyfly Road, Verwood, BH31 6BL

- 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 Richard Aitken against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 3/21/1155/HOU, dated 7 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is detached garage and boundary wall with gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on Moneyfly Road. Whilst the road accommodates a diverse mix of dwelling types and architectural styles, I observed that the area has a semi-rural character and the openness and verdant nature of the front gardens, along with the absence of built structures in front of the host dwellings, contributes strongly to this character, as does the unmade road. Whilst the properties generally have front boundary walls, fences or hedges, these are generally low and allow the open space in front of the properties to be appreciated from the street scene.
4. The scheme proposes to erect a detached garage and boundary wall with gate within the front garden of the appeal property, which would be located close to the unmade road. The proposed detached garage would be large and clearly evident within the street scene, given there is currently only a small boundary hedge as screening. Due to the open nature of the front gardens in the immediate area and the notable lack of built structures, the garage would appear as an incongruous feature. Further, although I do not consider it would dominate the host dwelling, due to its scale, it would appear as an overly dominant feature within the street scene.

5. On my site visit, I saw the double garage that has been erected at No 24 Moneyfly Road, which is a rare example where there is a built structure to the front of the host dwelling. In my view, this appears as an alien feature and a dominant structure that blocks views and competes for dominance with the host dwelling. Further, the boundary hedge designed to screen the large double garage appears to be struggling to establish and does little to mitigate the impacts on the street scene. I do not consider its presents justifies allowing further harmful development.
6. The appellant has suggested that additional planting could be secured by planning condition to mitigate the impacts of the scheme. However, this would not mitigate all views and the proposed garage would be evident through the gate and its roof would also likely to be visible over any boundary hedge. Further, there can be no guarantees that the new planting would mature sufficiently to mitigate the identified harm, as appears to be the case at No 24.
7. In terms of the proposed front boundary wall and gate, the vast majority of properties, either have low boundary walls, low fences, or hedges. The proposed rendered wall and gate would not be in keeping with this and would appear out of place, despite it being painted to match the host dwelling. Whilst there is a similar example to that proposed along the road at No 44 Moneyfly, I consider that this in itself appears at odds with the established character of the area and appears to have been built some time ago. Again, its presence does not, in my view, justify further harmful development.
8. Given my findings above, the scheme conflicts with Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan (Part 1), 2014 (the LP), which seeks high quality design that reflects local distinctiveness and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021.
9. The appellant has noted that Policy HE2 references the 'East Dorset Urban Design Guide' but this document is not found on the Council's website, which prevents him from examining the criteria in more detail. Whilst this is noted, I do not consider that this affects my ability to conclude that, for the reasons provided above, the scheme conflicts with the requirements of Policy HE2 of the LP. Further, I am required to consider the scheme against the development plan and whilst it is a material consideration, the urban design guide does not form part of the development plan.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the parish council and neighbouring residents did not raise any objection to the proposal. However, this does not overcome or outweigh the identified harm.
11. The appellant has raised concerns about the handling of the application by the Council. However, such matters are not for me to consider as

part of this appeal and should be taken up with the Council. In addition, I must consider and determine the appeal based on the details before me and it is not for me to suggest possible improvements to the scheme.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathan Manning

INSPECTOR