



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2023

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/23/3316010

23a The Broads, Pamphill, Wimborne, Dorset BH21 4DR

- 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 C Wood against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/HOU/2022/05394, dated 1 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is to convert bungalow to chalet cottage. Replace translucent conservatory roof with solid.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.23a is a detached, single-storey property located at a triangular junction of roads within 'The Broads' residential area. The area primarily comprises terraced and semi-detached, two-storey dwellings and bungalows.
4. The appeal property is different, formed of what was a detached garage to No.23. It has the same pitched roof form as the neighbouring properties but has a subservience and the space around the property is more limited. The property has a conservatory and an outbuilding which forms the southern boundary, it also adjoins a row of flat-roofed garages to the north.
5. The proposal would not alter the footprint, but the additional floor would significantly increase the property's height and massing. Additionally, integrating the conservatory through the changes to the materials visually adds to its scale. The half-hipped roof design would be at odds with the prevailing form and would have a bulky appearance. As a result, the proposed dwelling would have an incongruous appearance, which due to its siting would be intrusive in the street scene where it is seen from various points.
6. I accept that the external space has served the existing one-bedroom property for several years. However, unlike the regular layout of its neighbours with south-facing rear gardens, the amenity space located to the side is limited in size and would be overshadowed for a large proportion of the day. It would therefore provide a very restricted provision for a family-sized property, as

proposed, which it would serve for the long term and not just for the current occupiers.

7. The separation to the neighbouring property, No.23, would remain the same and the nearest element would be single storey. I therefore do not find that the development would have an overbearing impact on the living conditions of that property. Nonetheless, the scale and form of the development would be disproportionate to the plot and out of keeping with the surrounding area.
8. Overall, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would thereby fail to accord with Policy HE2 of the East Dorset Local Plan 2014 and the National Planning Policy Framework which promote high-quality development which is compatible with its surroundings including having regard to site coverage, scale, bulk, height, visual impact, and ensuring that the development functions well over its lifetime.

Other Matters

9. The application was also refused for failing to safeguard protected species. A preliminary appraisal advised that the property had the potential to support roosting bats and that further survey work would be required. There is no information before me in relation to the phase 2 assessment, however having found against the proposal on the main issue this would not alter my overall findings.

Conclusion

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

G Ellis

INSPECTOR