



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by C Rose BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1265/D/25/3371464

203 New Road, West Parley, Ferndown, Dorset BH22 8EE

- 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/s Mark/Mary Summers against the decision of Dorset Council.
 - The application Ref is P/HOU/2025/01564.
 - The development proposed is garage extension for gym and craft room at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for garage extension for gym and craft room at first floor level at 203 New Road, West Parley, Ferndown, Dorset BH22 8EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/HOU/2025/01564, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos:
J.35.2024A – Block & Location Plan.
J.35.2024.02 – Plans & Elevations. Proposed.
J.35.2024.03 – Elevations Sheet 2. Proposed.
J.35.2024 – 05 Section through Site.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development as set out above from the application form as neither party has provided written confirmation that a revised description has been agreed.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would amount to a separate dwelling; and,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the Dorset Heathland Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar and New Forest Special Conservation Area, Special Protection Area and Ramsar (the Protected Sites).

Reasons

Whether separate dwelling

4. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling and associated outbuildings set back from New Road off a long and gated driveway. Due to the presence of the gated driveway and given that the surrounding area is characterised by large dwellings in sizable plots set back from the road in a verdant setting, the buildings on the appeal site are not visible from the public domain.
5. The proposal is to construct a first floor above the existing garage/workshop building. The proposed plans show the first-floor extension covering the whole of the existing ground floor footprint creating a gym and craft room.
6. The Council argues that the proposed extension would result in a building tantamount to a new separate dwelling due to its resultant size, design and detached nature. In particular, the Council raise concern regarding the size of the craft room in addition to the gym and existing ground floor space. It states that the extension would result in a building that would exceed a scale that would be reasonably needed for activities ancillary to the dwelling.
7. However, at the time of my site visit, the existing garage/workshop was being fully utilised for the storage and restoration of vehicles, and I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the size of the proposed gym is not unusual. Furthermore, and while I acknowledge that the proposed craft room would be sizable, I have no substantive evidence before me to indicate that its size would exceed a scale that would be reasonably needed for a craft room, or for a combined use with other incidental uses, particularly given the full use of the existing ground floor.
8. In addition, there would be a clear functional link between the extension and the dwelling, no sub-division of the outdoor space, parking area or driveway, the resultant building is not shown as containing space for normal day-to-day living (such as a bedroom, kitchen and bathroom) and would remain incidental and subordinate in terms of its facilities and relationship to the host dwelling. Moreover, the application form and description of development clearly state that the proposal is for a gym and craft room and as such the application quite clearly proposes an incidental extension and not an independent dwelling or ancillary accommodation.
9. The Council alleges that the resultant building would be capable of independent occupation and would be capable of having all the facilities required for day-to-day independent occupation without the need for further planning permission. This is despite the fact that the submitted plans do not show this. Nevertheless, this is an argument that could be used in relation to the existing garage, or any proposed outbuilding or extension of a large enough size to be used as an independent dwelling, regardless of what the proposal is actually for.
10. The Council further state that it would not be able to enforce a condition to prevent internal changes that enable the creation of a separate dwelling. However, the level of difficulty involved in visiting the building and/or investigating property records to assess its use, in my opinion, would not make such a condition unenforceable. More to the point, such a condition is not necessary given that if the appeal is allowed, and the structure is not built or used as proposed, or if there is a future material change of use to create a separate dwelling, then another grant of permission would be required. At this point, any mitigation for impacts on the

Protected Sites could be secured, and the building or use would be at risk of enforcement action if permission is not granted.

11. It follows from the above that I conclude that the proposed development would not amount to a separate dwelling.

Integrity of the Protected Sites

12. The site lies within 400m of the Dorset Heathlands Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar sites (Dorset Heathlands) and within 13.8km of the New Forest Special Conservation Area, Special Protection Area and Ramsar.
13. Policy ME1 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan Part 1 – Core Strategy (April 2014) (LP) aims to protect internationally designated sites while LP Policy ME2 does not permit residential development within 400m of protected European and internationally protected heathlands. LP Policy ME2 also states that The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework Supplementary Planning Document will set out the type of development circumstances where mitigation is required.
14. The Dorset Heathlands Planning Framework 2020-2035 Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that extensions to residential dwellings that do not provide a net increase in dwellings are permitted within 400m of the Dorset Heathlands. Therefore, and as I have found above that the proposal would not result in the creation of a new additional dwelling, it would not result in additional recreational pressures or likely significant effects on the Dorset Heathlands.
15. Similarly, as the proposal would not result in the creation of a new additional dwelling and would not therefore result in additional recreational impacts, the proposal would not result in likely significant effects on the New Forest Special Conservation Area, Special Protection Area and Ramsar.
16. It follows from the above that there would be no harm to the integrity of the Protected Sites and as a result there is no requirement for any mitigation. As such, the proposal complies with LP Policies ME1, ME2 and the SPD, the aims of which I have outlined above.

Conditions

17. I have had regard to the tests in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to conditions. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary for a condition to confirm the approved plans in the interests of certainty.
18. A condition is necessary to ensure that external materials for the extension match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the area.
19. In light of my findings above, it is not necessary to impose a condition restricting the use to that ancillary to the dwelling as suggested by the Council.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

C Rose

INSPECTOR