



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3367224

7 Woodleaze Close, Poole, BH18 8BN

- 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 and Mrs R and S Miles against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is P/25/00532/HOU.
 - The development proposed is raise the roof and construct a first floor extension to create additional accommodation and use the outbuilding as an annexe, connected to the property at no. 7 Woodleaze Close, Poole.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to raise the roof and construct a first floor extension to create additional accommodation and use the outbuilding as an annexe, connected to the property at no. 7 Woodleaze Close, Poole at 7 Woodleaze Close, Poole, BH18 8BN, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P/25/00532/HOU and the plans submitted with it, 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 following approved plans: 6382-1, 6382-2 and 6382-3.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall only consist of materials the details of which are set out on the application form and in the approved plans to match those of the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) or the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) or any order(s) revoking and re-enacting either order with or without modification, the accommodation hereby permitted shall be used solely for residential purposes ancillary to the main property known as 7 Woodleaze Close and shall not be used at any time as a separate unit of living accommodation.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are whether the development would be ancillary to the host dwelling and its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 7 Woodleaze Close is a detached one and a half storey house set in a large corner plot towards the end of a cul-de-sac. There is an outbuilding towards the end of the rear garden housing a garage and family room/home office with vehicular access to the road and a large parking area. The surrounding residential area is characterised by well-spaced houses in a variety of forms, typically with distinctive gables and roof angles and widespread use of white painted render. The site lies within 400m of Heathland.
4. The relevant policies in the Poole Local Plan (the local plan) in this case include PP13, which sets out criteria for supporting independent living as part of multi-generational and extended families, and PP27 which relates to the design of new development. Policy BP08 of the Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan (the BNP) relates to the design of extensions.
5. The proposal would increase the size and height of the outbuilding to provide a living room and kitchen, bedrooms, and bathroom facilities. The accommodation would allow for a degree of living independent from the main house for members of the household or a carer. Although the building is located at some distance from the main house, there would continue to be a functional connection between them, the existing access and parking arrangements would remain the same and there would be no severance of the plot to create two separate ones. The property would remain as a single planning unit, with shared utilities, postal address and garden area.
6. The appellants have referred to a recent appeal regarding a similar proposal for a residential annexe (APP/V1260/D/22/3304119) elsewhere in the Council's area. The Inspector addressed the issue of the degree of independent living and the functional connection between the house and the annexe and referred to the case of *Uttlesford DC v SSE & White*. The judge in the latter found that even if the accommodation provided facilities for independent living it would not necessarily become a separate planning unit from the main house. That would be a matter of fact and degree.
7. The Council is concerned that the annexe would be used as a separate dwelling which would be contrary to its policies. I note that previous applications for a separate dwelling at the site have been dismissed on appeal. However, although the annexe would be capable of being occupied as an independent unit of accommodation, the proposal before me is for a residential annexe. My decision must rest on what is proposed, not what might happen in the future. Any future change to independent use would require separate planning permission which would be determined in accordance with local plan policies in place at the time and in the context of the location of the site within 400m of Heathland.
8. I conclude that, subject to appropriate conditions, the proposal would be ancillary to the main house and that, in this respect, it would be consistent with local plan policy PP13.

9. The proposed first floor extension and alterations would result in a considerable increase in the size and height of the outbuilding, with a steep asymmetric roof. However, I consider that it would not be out of scale with the surrounding properties and that it would be in keeping with the general pattern of development in the area, where there is no real cohesive style. The proposed materials would be sympathetic to the existing building and the main house and the nearby properties.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area and that, in this respect it is consistent with policies PP27 of the local plan and BP08 of the BNP.
11. The extended building would have windows facing the main house across the private rear garden, as is the case at present. There would be some degree of mutual overlooking between the two buildings. However, this would be acceptable since the proposal is not for a separate dwelling, but for use by family members or a future carer.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers and that, in this respect, it is consistent with policies PP27 of the local plan and BP08 of the BNP.
13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Conditions

14. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council, having regard to the tests set out in the Framework. A condition detailing the plans is necessary to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt. A condition relating to the materials is necessary in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development. The condition relating to the use of the building is necessary to meet the requirements of local plan policy PP13.
15. I consider the proposed condition regarding any future discovery of contamination to be unduly onerous for the conversion of a domestic garage. The Council has not put forward any local plan policy to support this approach. I find it unreasonable and unnecessary.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR