



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/24/3350840

Woodside, Daggons Road, Alderholt, Dorset, SP6 3DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kerry Joynes against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/HOU/2024/01934.
 - The development proposed is rooms in a new roof, a single-storey front and two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rooms in a new roof, a single-storey front and two-storey rear extension at Woodside, Daggons Road, Alderholt, Dorset, SP6 3DN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/HOU/2024/01934, 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 approved plans: Drg Nos 22179-00-01, 22179-00-02 E, 22179-00-03 E, 22179-00-04 E, 22179-00-05 E, 22179-00-06 E, 22179-00-07 E, 22179-00-08 E and 22179-00-09 E.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The development shall be carried out and thereafter maintained in accordance with the mitigation, compensation and biodiversity enhancement strategy contained within the *Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) & Bat Activity Report* prepared by ABR Ecology Ltd dated 11 June 2024.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon: - (i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; (ii) flooding; and (iii) biodiversity.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an isolated two-storey detached dwelling located in the countryside and within a woodland area identified by the Council as an Area of

Great Landscape Value (AGLV). It sits within a fairly large curtilage and set well back from Daggons Road, accessed from it via a single-lane track which continues past one side of the property's boundary as a public right of way. The dwelling has an L-shaped footprint and is chalet-style, with the first-floor accommodation contained within its roof space. The proposal has two distinct elements. One would replace an existing single-storey, lean-to at the end of its north extending limb with a two-storey extension. The second would involve raising the roof's ridge height over part of the western wing of the building to increase the floorspace to this part at first-floor level. This would involve a partial squaring of the building's footprint with a small extension to the north side of the dwelling.

4. The extension to the north limb of the building would merely project the two-storey form of the dwelling over an existing single-storey element. A new dormer to the side, west facing elevation of this new addition would match those that already exist to this side of the building in terms of alignment, proportions, and appearance. This part of the proposal would appear as a modest, and seamless addition.
5. Despite the step change proposed to the ridge-line along the western wing, the dwelling would maintain its low-rise chalet form and horizontal emphasis to its proportions. When glimpsed from Daggons Road, two new dormers to the south elevation would be seen to match a series of existing. Contrary to the Council's assertions, I find that these changes to the dwelling would be difficult to discern at distance from this aspect along the busy B3078. Although the gable features to the opposite side of the building would be to the property's front elevation, these would be effectively inward facing and seen only from the public domain along the nearby right of way at restricted angles of sight and only then through extensive amounts of foliage. Rather than seeking to mimic the dormers to this side of the building, their form would introduce new features, but which would reasonably assimilate themselves into the individualistic style of the dwelling.
6. The raised ridge line to the western wing, together with the twin, one and a half-storey gable features to the north elevation, would undeniably change the appearance of this part of the building by increasing its scale and prominence to a degree; but not significantly so in my judgement. Moreover, the dwelling already displays elements of its evolution over time. This part of the appeal proposal would simply add to its story by remodelling a later part of the original dwelling. With matching materials proposed throughout, I find the proposed changes to Woodside would appear neither jarring nor incongruous within their context.
7. Space around the building would be largely unaltered and with changes to the dwelling that would be compatible with the existing, I am unable to identify any harm to the rural woodland landscape of the wider area. As such, I find no conflict with Policies HE2 or HE3 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 - Core Strategy, adopted in 2014 (LP Part 1) as far as they require new development to display a quality of design that reflects local distinctiveness and is sympathetic to the landscape quality and character of the AGLV.

Flooding

8. The Council asserts that the site is in an area identified as being of high risk from groundwater flooding due to its location within a groundwater emergence zone. However, this is not supported by any substantive evidence. On the other hand, the appellant's submissions include advice from the Environment Agency (EA) that the

area is within flood zone 1 with a low probability of flooding. It is accepted that the EA flood map which informs this advice shows river and sea flooding data only and does not include other sources of flooding. But the appellant has additionally submitted evidence to show that the UK EA '*Check your long term flood risk*' service states that the yearly chance of flooding at Woodside from surface water flooding and from rivers and the sea, are both very low. In addition, the on-line check advises that flooding from groundwater is unlikely in this area.

9. Moreover, the Council's concerns over increased flood risk is based upon the impact of additional surface water runoff from the proposed extensions. In this case the extensions are principally over the existing building's footprint. Any additional surface water runoff as a result of the extensions would be negligible.
10. When all of these factors are considered, I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal would increase the risk of flooding. As such, there would be no conflict with LP Part 1 Policy ME6 which deals with flood management, mitigation, and defence.

Biodiversity

11. The planning application was accompanied by a *Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) & Bat Activity Report*. This report was updated on 11 June 2024, one day before the date of the Council's decision notice. The report informed that the property was found to support one day roost for low numbers of soprano pipistrelle bats and three day roosts for low numbers of common pipistrelle bats. As a consequence, the report included a mitigation, compensation, and biodiversity enhancement strategy. This was submitted to Dorset Council and approved by their Natural Environment Team as a certified Biodiversity Plan (BP) on 4 July 2024. I therefore have no reason to doubt that the proposal would satisfy the requirements of LP Part 1 Policy ME1 by protecting priority species and habitats.

Conditions

12. The Council has suggested five conditions in the event of the appeal succeeding. In addition to the standard time limit and plans conditions, a condition is required to ensure that the external materials used match those in the existing building. This would be sufficient to safeguard the character and appearance of the area without the need to submit any details to the Council for their approval. Given the progress that has been made with the certification of the BP, a condition is required to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the recommendations of the *Preliminary Roost Appraisal (PRA) & Bat Activity Report*.
13. In light of my findings with regard to flooding, no details of any surface water management scheme is necessary.
14. The application is clearly shown as extensions to an existing dwelling. Any future use of any part of the building as a separate self-contained unit would require planning permission. No condition to control such circumstances is necessary.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan INSPECTOR