

Appeal Decisions

1. PURPOSE AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose of Report:	To inform Members of notified appeals and appeal decisions and to take them into account as a material consideration in the Planning Committee's future decisions.
Recommendations:	It is RECOMMENDED that: (This report is for Information)
Wards:	Council-wide

3.0 APPEAL DECISIONS

3.1 Appeal Reference: APP/D1265/D/20/3265317

Planning Reference: 3/20/1174/HOU

Proposal: Extend existing ancillary outbuilding to form annexe

Address: 3 MATTERLEY COTTAGES, CRANBORNE ROAD, HORTON, WIMBORNE, BH21 7HN

Appeal: **Dismissed**

- 3.2 The site which has been subject to numerous planning applications lies within the designated Green Belt and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). 3 Matterley Cottage is a semi-detached dwelling house which is sited just off the main Cranborne Road (B3078) in rural part of Horton.
- 3.3 Together with properties 1, 2 and 4 Matterley Cottages, the property forms a cluster of 4 cottages located east of Cranborne Road (B3078) with a shared narrow access drive. This cluster of properties is surrounded by open fields on all sides including the western boundary which has open fields beyond the highway.
- 3.4 The proposal to extend the ancillary outbuilding to form an annexe was not accepted by the case officer as there from the submitted design and access statement and proposed plans it is evident that the existing structure has reached the end of its life and will be replaced by new building. The Inspector has noted Council's concerns however as the householder application for an extension to outbuilding was accepted by the Council the appeal decision was based on the development that applicant has applied for.
- 3.5 The Inspector considered that the main issues were:

- Whether or not the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt;
- Whether the proposal demonstrates sufficient dependence on the main dwelling; and
- If the proposal is inappropriate development whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

3.6 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

3.7 With regards to whether the proposal demonstrates sufficient dependence on the main dwelling, the Inspector has concluded that, due to the location of proposed annexe which is at some considerable distance from the dwelling; with little visual relationship to the dwelling due to the presence of a substantial hedge, there would be little or no dependence on the existing dwelling. Furthermore, in Inspectors view in this regard is bolstered by the inclusion of facilities that would allow the proposed accommodation to operate completely independently and that independent access to the building would be possible. Thus, there is insufficient dependence on the existing dwelling and the proposal is contrary to policy HODEV4.

3.8 With regards to other matters, the reference made to other appeal decisions made by the appellant, the Inspector has found that the circumstances of those appeal decisions are different from the appeal in hand where the Inspector has found different outcome with regards to the impact on openness from proposed development.

3.9 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it would also lead to a small loss of openness and other considerations in this case do not clearly outweigh the harm. A very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.

3.10 The appeal was therefore dismissed on this basis.