



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/24/3356103

84 Greenway Road, Weymouth, Dorset DT3 5BD

- 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 Mr Allen against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref. is P/HOU/2024/03992.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear two storey extension creating a balcony and alterations to the front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions for adjoining occupiers as regards outlook, light and privacy.

Reasons

3. I saw on my visit that the appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling with a flat roof attached garage on its western flank and a single storey rear extension of modest size. The appeal scheme is for a large two storey rear extension which the Officers Report refers to as being 'large' relative to the host dwelling.
4. I agree with this comment, especially as its volume and floor area would not normally be perceived as complying with local and national planning and design guidance for the requisite subservience of extensions to an existing building. However, I consider that the Report is also correct in its assessment that there is mitigation in terms of the good sized rear garden, the proposed double hipped roof form set down from the existing ridge, and the fact that the extension would for the most part unseen from the street scene and public views.
5. With that said, the large scale of the addition would be of a size to materially affect both neighbours. No. 86 is a chalet bungalow with a rear conservatory and is positioned to the west of the appeal dwelling. Whilst the proposed extension would be set away from the boundary, its two storey height to a similar depth as this conservatory would have the effect of significant enclosure and a corresponding loss of the outlook and skyline that currently exists above the boundary fence. There would additionally be some loss of morning sunlight and daylight. I have noted the appellant's reference to the 25 degree design guidance criterion but in this case the effect is heightened by the

understandably higher expectation of daylight and sunlight through the roof and walls of a conservatory and by the significant length of the proposed addition.

6. No. 82 to the east would be less affected, as the driveway of that property increases the separation distance to the proposed extension and it has a detached garage close to the mutual boundary. However as with No. 86, the two storey height and significant depth of the proposal would again to some extent affect both the outlook from the rear of the house and its garden. And in this case there would be some reduction in late afternoon and evening sunlight in the summer months. However, the effect on No. 82 on its own may well be insufficient to preclude the development and in this context I also note that no objection was forthcoming from the occupiers of that dwelling. Nonetheless, the effect on No. 82 is a contributory factor to the overall impact of the development.
7. As regards privacy, the rear gardens of both Nos. 82 and 86 would be overlooked from the balcony, albeit there is the potential for the scheme to be modified by the provision of side screens or alteration to a Juliet balcony.
8. In concluding on the main issue, I find that the extension's proposed depth at two storey height would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of neighbours as regards outlook and light. In addition, the balcony would affect their privacy. These effects would be in harmful conflict with Policy ENV16 of the West Dorset, Weymouth & Portland Local Plan 2015 and with Government policy in paragraph 135f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, as revised in December 2024.

Other Matter

9. The second reason relates to the effect on bats, a protected species, of alterations to the existing roof to facilitate the extension. However, there is insufficient information in the Officers Report to explain whether suburban properties are normally the subject of precautionary measures in this respect. In the event, this matter is not a deciding factor because of my finding on the main issue and does not need further consideration in this appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons explained above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR