



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2023

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/22/3293850

17 & 19 St Helens Road, Sandford, Wareham BH20 7AX

- 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 Messers A Gymer and Farrell against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref 6/2021/0117, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is to convert existing first floor flat at number 19 St Helens Road to office accommodation and construct bungalow to vacant land to the rear of number 17.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a long narrow site to the rear of 17 St Helens Road, although the proposed dwelling would be accessed from Brian Close. St Helens Road exists of a varied pattern of development, with a mixture of houses and some flat style development along its length. Accessed from St Helens Road are a number of cul-de-sacs, of which Brian Close is one. Brian Close is a spacious cul-de-sac, with properties set within relatively generous plots and, whilst some have been extended, they are generally modest in form and shape with an engaging relationship with the street scene. Beyond the Close, and scattered within some of the plots, are established trees which draw the eye as a dominant feature of the area and reaffirm the modest developments within the Close.
4. The constraints of the appeal site, with it forming the long narrow space to the rear of 17 St Helens Road, would result in the front elevation of the proposed development facing towards the rear of that building. The new dwelling would have no relationship with either Brian Close, or indeed St Helens Road. Vehicular access from Brian Road to the front of the dwelling would create a compressed and somewhat unnatural parking arrangement, hemming the dwelling even further. The configuration of the site, with the proximity of the side elevations to the boundaries, and the forced parking provisions, would, to

my mind, result in the development appearing cramped and contrived, and out of keeping with the other built form in the area.

5. I note that there are a variety of designs of buildings in the area, and the style and scale of the dwelling would not be out of keeping. However, this does not overcome the negative effect of the situation of the dwelling and its failure to integrate with any street scene. The appellant suggested an alternative design which would result in a reduction in the side elevation as part of this appeal. However, As I have found on the basis of the original plans that the design and scale of the dwelling itself would be acceptable, I do not consider it necessary to consider the amended plan.
6. I find that due to its contrived configuration and failure to integrate with the streetscene, the proposed development would be harmful to the character of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy D of the Purbeck Local Plan which expects proposals for all development to positively integrate with its surroundings.

Other matters

7. Wareham is within the catchment area of the Poole Harbour Special Protection Area (the SPA). The appellant asserts that, taking account the cessation of the residential use of the first floor of No 17 St Helens Road, the effect on the SPA would be neutral. In essence the proposal would not result in any additional dwellings. However, as I have found that the proposal would conflict fundamentally with the development plan, it is not necessary for me to consider this matter any further.

Conclusion

8. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all other matters raised, including the accessible location of the site and the positive contribution of an additional dwelling to the supply of housing, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR