



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by **C Coles MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/25/3364471

58 West Street, Corfe Castle, Dorset BH20 5HE

- 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 P Dismorr against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/HOU/2024/07629.
 - The development proposed is single storey side and rear extension, front entrance porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Corfe Castle Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a modest two-storey end of terrace dwelling with a hipped roof on a wide plot fronting West Street which forms one of the principal roads within the village extending southwards from the Castle and square. This section of West Street is verdant with grass verges and more modern dwellings with front gardens of varying size flanking the street on both sides. The site is located close to listed buildings within West Street.
4. The site is located on the curve of the road and due to its position within the street and low boundary wall the dwelling and its open side garden is highly visible and positively contribute to the verdant character of the area.
5. The appraisal identifies the CA as having a heavy concentration of nationally listed buildings of the highest quality. Development along West Street is identified as having a number of wide gaps and broad verges marking a transition toward a townscape of lower density. The appeal site is identified as part of a modern suburban house form which has an intrusive impact on West Street but which is tempered by broader townscape quality. Notwithstanding this, the terrace reflects local vernacular utilising similar materials and colour palette as more historically and architecturally significant buildings found nearby.
6. The proposed development would remove a lean-to conservatory extension and partially demolish a store to the rear of the dwelling and replace these with single storey side and rear flat roof extensions and a front entrance porch.

7. The width of the proposed single storey side extension would be more than half that of the host dwelling and more than its full depth. The proposed single storey rear extension would have the same width as the existing property but would be approximately a third as deep. The proposal would engulf the original dwelling and appear as a disproportionately large addition which would harm its modest scale.
8. The proposed development would not be sensitive to the scale of the existing dwelling and the forward projection makes it more prominent, on account of its position in the street scene, and out of keeping with the modest character and appearance of the dwelling. In addition, the flat roof design of the proposal would not respect the original hipped roof form on the dwelling or the terrace as a whole.
9. I note the appellants reasoning for making use of the width of the site, however, this approach would not be considered appropriate in these circumstances due to the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling from the size and prominence of the proposal and the flat roof design. The dwelling is the end of a terrace and therefore would be viewed as part of a larger building, however, the individual dwellings making up the terrace have their own distinct curtilages and therefore are not viewed as one single dwelling where the scale of the proposal may be more appropriate.
10. As such, the size of the proposal would appear as a disproportionately large addition and the flat roof design would not respect the character and appearance of the area.
11. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special attention to be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
12. Paragraphs 212, 214 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) require great weight to be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. The proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area leading to less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA and no public benefits have been identified by the appellant from the proposal that would outweigh this harm.
14. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the proposal would adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property and area and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal therefore conflicts with the statutory presumption under s72(1) of the Act and would be contrary to Policies E2 and E12 of the Purbeck Local Plan which amongst other things, expect proposals to demonstrate a high quality of design that positively integrates with its surroundings and to protect and where possible enhance Purbecks designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

15. Paragraph 189 of the Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. Section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 (LURA) places a duty on relevant authorities to further the statutory purposes of the National Landscape. The Council do not raise any concerns over the effect of the extension itself on the natural beauty of the National Landscape by virtue of its single storey nature with no rooflights/lanterns that would result in harm to the visual landscape character or dark night skies of the Dorset National Landscape. Based on the evidence and my observations on my site visit, I am satisfied that there would be no harm in that regard. The proposal would align with the statutory purpose of the National Landscape and would be considered acceptable in this respect.
16. The lack of objection does not equate to an absence of harm. In coming to my decision I have paid regard to the comments of the Parish Council and considered as part of my overall assessment of the scheme, however, these comments do not lead me away from my conclusions on the main issue in this case.
17. I acknowledge the appellants concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a Section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have solely had regard to planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

C Coles

INSPECTOR