



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 May 2025

by **Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/25/3362808

20 Vicarage Road, Verwood, Dorset BH31 6DR

- 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 Daniel Kench against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref. is P/HOU/2024/06524.
 - The development proposed is for a first floor extension to existing footprint. Existing single storey extension roof removed, first floor area expanded with new roof tying into the existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the planning application the subject of this appeal was determined, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the “Framework”) has been published (12 December 2024) and consequently amended on 7 February 2025. There has been no material change to national planning policy in respect of householder appeals and therefore I considered that it was not necessary to refer back to the parties. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the living conditions of the occupants of 22 Vicarage Road, with specific reference to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal would comprise a first floor extension over an existing single storey element attached to the host dwelling, bringing built form in alignment with the existing rear projecting gable.
5. The house at no 22 is set away from the shared boundary although it does have a conservatory to its rear/side facing elevation and an intervening driveway which is utilised as an outdoor sitting area/ patio. The gap between nos 20 and 22 may exceed some of the separation distances between properties within the immediate locality, although ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits.
6. The existing gable wall of no 20 is already quite imposing within the immediate rear sitting out area of no 22 and the increase in height of the flank wall, which would consist of a continuous eaves line running from front to rear, would increase the overbearing presence of the host dwelling.

7. Bearing in mind the existence of the existing dwelling, other intervening buildings such as the garage within the curtilage of no 22, and mature trees found within gardens due south of the appeal site, it is more difficult to quantify how much sunlight would be lost by the construction of the proposal. However, due to its orientation, I fail to see how the additional height of the two storey extension would partially obscure direct sunlight from an easterly direction in the early morning during the winter season.
8. It is not for me to comment upon whether or not the assessment of the proposal by the Council was biased towards the neighbouring occupants at no 22, however I see no issue with the use of the word “unneighbourly” per se as I have come across this term many times in the past in dealing with appeals.
9. I acknowledge that the appellant attempted to ensure that the extension would impact their neighbours as little as reasonably possible, however, by virtue of the construction of the second storey hard up against the boundary, I can only conclude that the proposal would give rise to a demonstrable loss of outlook to the occupants of the neighbouring property, both from the aforementioned conservatory and the private sitting out area. I therefore conclude that the proposal is contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy 2014 which requires development to be compatible with or improve its surroundings in terms of a number of criteria, including the relationship to nearby properties and minimising general disturbance to amenity.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR