



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by E Worley BA (Hons) Dip EP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/25/3369125

Proposal: Erection of outbuilding (retrospective) at 92 Blandford Road North, Beacon Hill, Dorset BH16 6AD

Application Ref: P/HOU/2025/01425.

Decision – Allowed and planning permission is granted.

1. The planning application form indicates that the development to which the appeal relates has been completed. My observations on site confirm this to be the case, and I have considered the appeal accordingly.
2. Permission is sought for the use of the outbuilding for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis. Any subsequent change of use would require a further grant of planning permission.

Reasons

Issue - whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies

3. The Council contend that the outbuilding is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The exceptions to inappropriate development listed in the Framework include the extension or alteration of a building, provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. It has been established in case law¹ that a residential outbuilding, which is physically separated from a dwelling, can be considered to be an extension of a dwelling.
4. The outbuilding, which is domestic in scale, is used by a family member for purposes associated with the residential use of the host dwelling, and due to the proximity and high degree of intervisibility between them, it would have a close relationship with it. Consequently, it would be reasonable to conclude it is a normal domestic adjunct and therefore falls to be considered as an extension to the existing building.
5. The appeal submissions do not indicate that the existing dwelling has been subject to any previous extensions. By virtue of its height and overall scale, the outbuilding is visually subservient to the host property. Therefore, having regard to the increase in floor area as well as the siting, design and volume of the outbuilding, relative to

¹ Warwick DC v SSLUHC, Mr J Storer & Mrs A Lowe [2022] EWHC 2145 (Admin)

92 Blandford Road North, it does therefore not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building.

6. For the foregoing reasons the outbuilding meets the exception at paragraph 154 c) of the Framework and does not comprise inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Accordingly, it would not conflict with the aims of the Framework which seek to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development and does not require an assessment to be made upon openness or the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Nor does it conflict with the policy cited in the decision notice.

Other Matters

7. The Council has not raised an objection to the proposal in terms of its effect on the character and appearance of the area, the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or highway safety. Given the height, scale, siting and external materials, together with the proposed use of the building, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion.
8. The specific circumstances that apply in this case are unlikely to be repeated elsewhere, therefore the weight to be attached to concerns that the proposal would set a precedent is limited. Moreover, should the use require a licence under a separate regime, this is a matter to be resolved outside of the appeal process.
9. The development is not identified in the Council's Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2025 Supplementary Planning Document, adopted April 2020, as a type of development for which mitigation would be required with regards to the effects on the Dorset Heathlands.
10. Since the appeal scheme seeks retrospective planning permission, a condition relating to the implementation of the permission is not necessary. Any future material change of use of part of the site to create a separate planning unit would require planning permission. As such, it is not necessary to impose a condition to prevent the occupation of the outbuilding independently from the dwelling.

Conclusion

11. The proposal complies with the development plan as a whole and nothing indicates a decision otherwise.

Condition

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos; 6252-01 Location & Block Plans, 6252-02 Site Plan and 6252-03 Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations.

E Worley

INSPECTOR