

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

**by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27 August 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/19/3230461**

**Wychwood Lodge, The Heath, Matching Road, Hatfield Heath,  
Essex CM22 7AD**

- 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 Mr and Mrs Mark Guirey against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
  - The application Ref UTT/18/3306/HHF was refused by notice dated 8 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a mock Tudor two-storey detached dwelling adjacent to the Green Belt on its eastern boundary. It lies within a village excluded from the Green Belt. This part of the village is characterised by individual properties which are situated in a spacious verdant setting.
4. Saved Policy S6 in the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) permits limited development compatible with the character of the settlement and its setting. Saved Local Plan Policy H8 seeks to ensure that extensions respect the scale and design of the original dwelling. I consider these saved policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework where the Framework seeks to protect the Green Belt and ensure good design.
5. The proposal includes a two-storey rear extension to a maximum depth of some 4 metres across the rear of the main part of the building. The ridge heights of the three gables would extend at the same height as the ridge height of the existing front gable. Whilst the rear elevation of the roof would be broken up by three gables, there would be a significant increase in bulk of the roof structure. As such, I consider that the proposed rear extension would overwhelm the appearance of the existing dwelling. This would be exacerbated

- by the two gable projections either side of a recessed gable and would not respect the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
6. The proposed rear extension would be visible to some extent from neighbouring properties and lies adjacent to the Green Belt where there is a row of trees that provide some screening. In this setting, I consider that the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition, not in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved Local Plan Policies S6 and H8.
  7. I have been referred to saved Local Plan Policy S3, which relates to other villages, so is not relevant to this appeal. I have been referred to saved Local Plan Policy GEN2, which is a design policy that does not mention the character or appearance of an existing dwelling. It does cross refer to unspecified adopted Supplementary Design Guidance and Supplementary Planning Documents, which I have not been provided with. On this basis, I am unable to determine whether or not the proposal accords with this policy.
  8. I note the family circumstances and the need for additional accommodation. Whilst I sympathise with these requirements, I have found in the wider public interest.
  9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised including the example of the dwelling north of the appeal site. The proposal before me is for an extension rather than a new dwelling and the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling is the main issue. Therefore, the adjacent dwelling is not directly comparable to the proposal before me.

*J L Cheesley*

INSPECTOR