
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by Juliet Rogers BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/24/3354990

Proposal: erection of a family room/dog room to the rear at ground floor level at 2 Harriets Gift Cottages, Grange, Wimborne, Dorset, BH21 4HS

Application Ref: P/HOU/2024/03525

Decision – dismissed

Reasons

Issue – whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt

1. The appeal property has been extended to the side with a two-storey addition of a substantial scale and volume when compared to the original dwelling¹. The proposal would provide further floorspace and volume to the rear. Whilst a modest addition, when combined with the existing side extension, the proposal would be a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building².
2. Consequently, it would not meet the relevant exception of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and comprises inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which attracts substantial weight in my decision.

Issue – the effect of the proposal on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt

3. As the proposal would increase the volume and mass of the host property, it would introduce development where there currently is none, despite being located to the rear and between adjacent various outbuildings. This would lead to a modest loss in the spatial aspect of the openness of the Green Belt.
4. The proposed extension would not be visible as part of the principal elevation of the property nor from public vantage points. Nonetheless, the perpendicular relationship of the pitched roof of the proposal and higher ridgeline than the outbuildings and adjacent extension to the adjoining cottage, would be experienced by neighbouring occupiers and the wider countryside. This would lead to a loss of the visual aspect of the openness of the Green Belt, albeit small.
5. The proposal would harm the spatial and visual aspects of the openness of the Green Belt. As such, it would not fulfil the Green Belt's purpose of assisting in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and, in accordance with the Framework, should be given substantial weight.

¹ As of 1 July 1948

² Paragraph 154c of the Framework

Issue – whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm resulting from the inappropriate development, to amount to very special circumstances

6. The proposal would provide additional space for the appellant and their family, including tidying up the dog pen area. The scale of this private benefit would, however, be small and I attach minor weight to it in this decision.
7. Whilst the adjoining cottage has also been extended and a glass fronted detached building constructed on its plot, few substantive details of the circumstances which led to these additions being approved or the planning regime in place at the time are before me. Therefore, even if these additions are bulkier than the proposal, they do not weigh in favour of the grant of planning permission for the appeal scheme.

Green Belt Balance and Conclusion

8. The other considerations above attract minor weight in this decision and, therefore, do not clearly outweigh the substantial weight to be given to the proposal's harm by reason of inappropriateness to the Green Belt and upon its openness. Consequently, the very special circumstances required to justify the grant of planning permission have not been demonstrated.

Juliet Rogers

INSPECTOR