



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 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: 15 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/23/3324864

Hedgerow, Verwood Road, Woodlands, Verwood BH21 8LJ

- 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 & Mrs M Jones against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref P/HOU/2023/01003, dated 28 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

3. It is agreed between the main parties that the site is in the Green Belt and that the principle of infill development within the village is established and the proposed development would therefore comply with saved Policy GB7 of the East Dorset Local Plan 2002 (LP). There is no reason for me to disagree. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. There is a distinct mix of architectural styles in the immediate area and the village as a whole, which has a dispersed and rural feel. Dwellings generally face their road frontage with a set back and a garden to the front. High hedges prevail along Verwood Road, although the same forming the front boundary of the appeal site has been replaced with timber fencing. There is similar to the side elevation of the rear garden of a two storey dwelling opposite. Front gardens are open and mostly undeveloped albeit the street scene has an enclosed feel due to the closeness of some buildings and mature /built boundary treatments. There are outbuildings, some to the front, but there is a defined hierarchy to their relationship with their larger host. These matters give the area a clear identity and consistency and contribute positively to its character and appearance.
5. The garage, whilst not uncommon in being to the front of the plot directly adjacent the back edge of the street, would be of a contextually large scale for such development in the area. It would, as a result, compete visually with even

the altered host dwelling which would, should an extant scheme be implemented, be made noticeably larger. The building's size, coupled with its prominent position and on slightly higher ground due to the topography, would therefore intrude on and disrupt the area's defined hierarchy for outbuildings and their host, fail to be sufficiently subservient and consequently detrimentally affect the quality of its consistency.

6. The two other examples of garages forward of the front elevation in Woodlands are at Applegate and Joanda. They are comparatively smaller in scale than their host dwellings. They do not therefore sufficiently relate to the proposal to make it acceptable. The appeal scheme would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Which would bring it into conflict with saved Policy GB7 of the LP which seeks, amongst other things, to allow development that is of a scale and character that respects the existing village form within a Green Belt. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies HE2 and HE3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1, Core Strategy 2014. These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development respects local distinctiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

R. Dickson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR