

23 CHURCH GREEN

BISHOPS CAUNDLE

DT9 5NN

## PLANNING STATEMENT

SEPTEMBER 2022



First Floor Office, 172 Old Christchurch Road, Bournemouth, Dorset BH1 1NU

Telephone: 07828 711504

Email: [david@alpplanning.co.uk](mailto:david@alpplanning.co.uk)

Web: [www.hlfplanning.co.uk](http://www.hlfplanning.co.uk)

Statement Prepared By:

**David Bevan** MRTPI AMIMA  
**For HLF Planning Ltd**

T: 01202 801899  
M: 07828 711504  
E: david@alpplanning.co.uk

Ordnance survey licence 100057356 (if applicable).

## **1.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 The application proposes a new boundary fence and single-storey rear extension.

## **2.0 REASONS FOR THE PROPOSAL**

- 2.1 The existing boundary wall is located within the curtilage of the application property. This has previously left a grass verge abutting the pavement. However, this wall also encroaches into the rear garden of the dwelling that results in a loss of amenity space.
- 2.2 The relocation and installation of new boundary treatment provides a larger garden area and provides greater scope for the house to extend to the rear to improve the living conditions of the applicant and his family.

## **3.0 CONTEXT OF THE DEVELOPMENT**

- 3.1 The site is located on the eastern side of Church Green and is a two-storey semi-detached house. The existing wall is stone extending north alongside the rear garden. There was previously a tree between the wall and highway (pavement), but this tree is no longer in situ.
- 3.2 Church Green is a cul-de-sac with only around a dozen homes passed the point of the wall. The surrounding area is largely traditional in appearance but the property is not included within the conservation area that it abuts.
- 3.3 The nearest listed building is Byways, Caundle Street, which is to the east. The development is not considered to be within the setting of that building as therefore has no impact on its listing.

## **4.0 PLANNING POLICY**

- 4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined with regard to the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Since 27 March 2012, all Development Plan policies should be

in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is therefore appropriate to consider the development proposals compliance with the NPPF as well as the Development Plan.

### ***National Policy***

4.2 The NPPF was first published in 2012 and was superseded in its entirety by the revised NPPF in 2018 and recently amended further in February 2019 and July 2021. This document sets out the Government's objectives for the planning system and explains that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development through three overarching objectives.

4.3 The NPPF has removed the reference to a golden thread of sustainable development and explained that the objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways;

- *the social objective is to ensure that a sufficient range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations;*
- *the environmental objective looks to minimise waste and pollution and adapting to climate change; and*
- *the economic objective seeks a responsive and competitive economy, supporting growth and improved productivity.*

The NPPF describes the three threads of sustainable development and explains that the planning system must deliver a social objective. To achieve social gain decisions need to meet the needs of present and future generations.

4.4 The NPPF puts significant weight into good design. The external appearance of the proposal has sought to provide significant social gains and balancing these against ensuring that the project remains viable. The existing stone wall, whilst pleasant, does not contribute significantly to the overall character of the area. The proposed replacement boundary is a wicker in material. This is softer in appearance and will aid in assimilating with the area. This is also a lighter coloured material which is considered to be preferable as it is moving closer to the pavement and thus retains a sense of light and spaciousness. The rear extension will be finished in materials to match the existing property.

4.5 With regard to the rear extension, the dwelling could be expanded in a similar fashion through the provisions of the GPDO; with a depth of 3.00m rather than the 3.30m proposed. However, the

nominally longer depth is submitted and this will give the LPA much greater control through the use of conditions.

- 4.6 The design process is satisfied that the design is appropriate in making the most of this site without overdevelopment. Paragraph 127 the NPPF adds clarity on this by stating that good design should *“optimise the potential of the site”*.

- 4.7 Boundary treatments have the potential to impact upon the public highway. However, there remains a gap between the wicker fence and the pavement. The relocation of the fence will have no impact on road users. Paragraph 111 states:

*“Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.”*

The highways impacts of the development would not be severe as there would be no impact on highway safety.

#### **Local Policy**

- 4.8 The West Dorset, Weymouth and Portland Local Plan (2011-2031) was adopted in October 2015. It is the key document within the suite of documents that form the Local Development Plan. The most relevant policies are ENV12: The design and positioning of buildings and HOUS2: Other residential development outside defined development boundaries.
- 4.9 ENV12 requires that the scale, mass and positioning of the building should reflect the purpose for which the building is proposed. In this case the scale of the extension is single storey and the fence is below 2.00m in height. The purpose of the fence is naturally to form a boundary for the garden and this needs to be of an appropriate height to achieve privacy.
- 4.10 The quality of the architecture is appropriate to the dwelling, with simple but attractive designs that are suitable within a residential setting. The materials are considered sympathetic to the natural and built surroundings and the gap between the fence and the highway/pavement (the fence does not fully abut the highway, gives opportunity for landscaping if the LPA consider that the appearance of the fence needs softening further.
- 4.11 HOUS6 submits that the extension of an existing lawful dwelling-house located outside the defined development boundaries will be permitted provided that the extension is subordinate in scale and

proportions to the original dwelling, and does not harm the character of the locality or its landscape setting. As detailed above the extension is nominally larger than what could be achieved through the deemed consent of the GPDO. It is an accepted matter of guidance that deemed consent by its very nature has been considered to be acceptable with regard to the Act and therefore the material consideration of 30cm is not considered to compromise this position.

## **5.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 Proposals need to consider the planning balance between controlling any perceived harm on public amenity with the understandable desires of applicants to improve their property and living conditions.
- 5.2 The design of the proposal is considered to be appropriate for the area it follows a sensible solution to improving the useable private amenity space. The extension would not be out-of-character with the local area. Combined the proposal would provide for a notable increase in living conditions for the applicants. Providing clear social benefits of allowing the applicant to adapt the home to meet the needs of current and future generations.
- 5.3 The applicant is willing to consider any conditions that the Local Planning Authority may feel are appropriate to achieve planning consent.