



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/23/3322838

Redcliffe, Great Lane, Shaftesbury, Dorset, SP7 8ET

- 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 Mike Barclay against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/HOU/2022/08052, dated 17 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a veranda to the south elevation of the existing house (facing Layton Lane).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the addition of a veranda to the south elevation of the existing house (facing Layton Lane) at Redcliffe, Great Lane, Shaftesbury, Dorset, SP7 8ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/HOU/2022/08052, dated 17 January 2023, 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: The location plan, Existing North West elevation, Existing South West elevation, Existing South East elevation, Proposed North West elevation, Proposed South West elevation and Proposed South East elevation.

Procedural Matter

2. The planning application was made in the name of Dr Michael Barclay. The appeal was made in the name of Mike Barclay. I am satisfied that the applicant and the appellant are one and the same person.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the Shaftesbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling occupying a corner, almost wedge-shaped plot, where Great Lane joins Layton Lane at an angled intersection. Due to the topography of the area and the rising gradient of Great Lane, it sits elevated above the levels of Layton Lane and in a recessed

position behind a steep and heavily vegetated frontage. The site is located within the Shaftesbury Conservation Area (CA), the immediate area of which around Layton Lane comprises generally low-density housing of mixed types, ages, and sizes. I saw for myself that the CA's special character around the appeal site, and as described for the Layton Lane Character Zone within the Shaftesbury Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2031 (SNP), is derived from the semi-rural appearance of the leafy network of narrow lanes and the variety of architecture spanning from the Georgian period through to the modern. Although not a terraced house, as suggested by the reference to the *Dorset Historic Towns Survey* within the Council's planning officer's report, Redcliffe is a fine example of an Edwardian period property that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The proposal would add a lean-to extension across the full width of the property's south elevation facing towards Layton Lane. Described as a veranda, the extension would be lightweight, constructed principally of timber and glass, enclosed along approximately two-thirds of its length, and open-sided across the remainder.
6. Whether the south elevation of Redcliffe is the front elevation, as suggested in some of the Council's submissions, is moot. The property's address referencing Great Lane, where access is currently taken, would suggest not, and from my own observations, I saw that the frontage to Layton Lane is inactive. Furthermore, despite the prominence of the building due to its exposed corner location and elevation above Layton Lane, the ground floor of the building's south facade is not exposed to view from the immediate street scene, and can only be glimpsed in part from views in the approach from further afield, where it is not a dominant part of the wider vista. On this basis, I do not consider the south elevation of the property to be particularly sensitive to change.
7. I recognise the value of symmetry to the original design of this detached house. As a full width addition, this characteristic would be maintained by the appeal proposal. As a simple and lightweight, glazed structure which would allow much of the original ground floor facade to remain and to be seen, I am unable to agree with the Council's assessment that the proposal would result in an incongruous juxtaposition of styles or that it would unacceptably mask the building's facade.
8. In addition, I saw a number of examples in the locality where properties fronting Layton Lane displayed either conservatory or veranda style projections facing towards the road. Some were prominent where the dwelling sat close to the roadside, others were not so, being set behind deeper landscaped frontages. Some were obvious extensions to individual properties, as at Nos 38, 40 and 42 Layton Lane, whilst others stretched across a full terrace, possibly as part of the original design, as at Shooters Paddock. They all contribute to the eclectic mix of architectural styles that are prevalent within the CA.
9. I accept that the proposal would result in a significant change to an elevation fronting a road. However, there would be no disruption to any established rhythm or symmetry to the street scene. On the contrary, the proposed extension would merely mimic the size, type and location of a feature that is not atypical on properties within the locality and which, regarding the specific circumstances at Redcliffe, I find would complement the character and

appearance of the dwelling. Overall, the appeal property would continue to make a positive contribution to the wider character and appearance of the area and as a consequence, there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the CA, the significance of which as a designated heritage asset would therefore be unaffected. I therefore find no conflict with Policy 5 of the North Dorset Local Plan Part 1 2011-2013 (January 2016) which seeks to avoid harm to the significance of a heritage asset, or with SNP Policies SFDH1, SFDH6 or SFDH7 as far as they seek to ensure development respects local character, including design details of individual buildings and materials used. For these same reasons I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conditions

10. The Council has not suggested any conditions in the event of the appeal succeeding. Nevertheless, in addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary to provide certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, I find that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the Shaftesbury Conservation Area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR