
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/16/3162573

**Willow Lodge, Feathers Hill, Hatfield Broad Oak, Bishop's Stortford
CM22 7HB**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss D Booth against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/16/1298/HHF, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of a new first floor, two storey front and single storey front and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is at the end of a short row of dwellings that are in the countryside just outside the village of Hatfield Broad Oak. Although there is a line of development extending along Feathers Hill from the village there is a distinct open break at Pincey Brook. The existing dwelling is a bungalow which is sited end-on to the road and at a higher level than its neighbour given the rising land levels. It is outside the development limits as defined in the Uttlesford Local Plan (LP) (2005).
 4. The existing dwelling is close to the road and its elevated level in relation to the road gives it prominence. I saw that there are trees along the road which would provide some screening when they are in leaf when approaching from the west. However the proposal by adding an additional full storey would substantially increase the bulk and height of the dwelling. The existing trees would be unlikely to fully screen this, particularly in winter months and the development would in any case be very prominent given its elevation and proximity to the road.
 5. The Council has previously approved a scheme for the provision of accommodation within the roof space which would have included the addition of dormer windows and a glazed front extension similar to that now proposed. That permission has lapsed but irrespective of whether or not the Council
-

would approve this again the appeal proposal would be substantially larger and bulkier.

6. The immediately adjacent dwelling ('Meadow View') is of a chalet design and is built into the slope with a lower ground floor. That dwelling is of a modest size in relation to the scale of the proposal and I saw that the existing bungalow is higher than that dwelling. The other remaining dwellings on the adjacent part of the road are bungalows. For these reasons the proposal would be dominant in relation to the adjacent group of dwellings and the street scene. This effect would be particularly apparent given the location of the site in the countryside.
7. For these reasons the proposal would not accord with saved policy S7 of the LP which requires that development in the countryside protects or enhances the character of the area. Neither would the proposal accord with saved policy GEN2 of the LP which requires development to be compatible with the scale, form and appearance of surrounding buildings.
8. The proposal would also completely alter the appearance and form of the existing dwelling and would not accord with saved policy H8 of the LP which requires that extensions respect the scale and design of the original building.
9. Although the LP policies pre-date the National Planning Policy Framework and are not fully consistent with it they are generally consistent with its core planning principles in terms of taking account of the character of the local area and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. I conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR