



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023 by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/W/23/3320825

22 Central Avenue, Corfe Mullen, Wimborne BH21 3JD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Putland against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/PIP/2022/07995, dated 21 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as "Erection of up to 1 dwelling with vehicular access off Central Avenue and on site car parking".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. The proposal is for Permission in Principle (PiP). The PiP route has two stages. The first establishes whether a site is suitable in principle. Technical Details Consent (TDC) is the second stage when the detailed development proposals are addressed. This appeal relates to the first stage. The scope of the considerations for this is limited to location, land use and the amount of development¹. All other matters come under the TDC stage after PiP has been granted. I have dealt with the proposals accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with specific regard to its location and the amount of development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Central Avenue has a marked lower density of housing compared to other nearby roads. It is comprised mainly of Edwardian-style detached dwellings set back from the road in large, enclosed plots. The properties each have an individual appearance, as they have been subject to alterations over time, but are unified by their size and positioning. The site is within the Central Avenue Special Character Area (SCA). The special qualities of the SCA are in its distinct street pattern and a strong sense of spaciousness owing largely to the overall size of the plots relative to the areas of developed land within them. These

¹ PPG Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 58-012-20180615

features also lend a quality in consistency to Central Avenue and by association the SCA.

6. The proposal would increase the density of development on the appeal site and since the existing dwelling would remain, the otherwise open feel to the site, and by association the immediate area, would be reduced. The subsequent adverse effect this would have on the consistency of the area would result in an unacceptable departure from the unique qualities and thus identity of the SCA. There are outbuildings within local plots, but these appear to follow a clear hierarchy in being much smaller in scale than their host and more importantly part of the plot as a whole rather than being hived off in the same way a new dwelling would. These may have their own access and more likely than not a fresh curtilage with boundary treatment and associated domestic paraphernalia.
7. I am aware that there have been plot subdivisions locally and within the SCA. From what I have seen of them, they appear to have maintained a sense of spaciousness through either the scheme itself, repeating an already established pattern of development or being a much larger and thus a potentially more accommodating plot. The appeal site is one of the smaller SCA plots and with the retention of the existing dwelling, the insertion of a second one and all that such would entail would lead to an unacceptable crowding effect and the harm I have explained above. These other examples do not therefore persuade me to recommend the appeal be allowed.
8. The harm the above would cause to the character and appearance of the area would lead to conflict with Policies HE2 and LN2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy 2014. These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things that development must be of a high quality which reflect and enhance areas of recognised local distinctiveness, while respecting local density of development.

Other Matters

9. Third parties have raised matters pertaining to living conditions, in particular privacy. These are however outside the scope of a PiP case. I am not therefore considering them within this recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate otherwise. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

R Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR