
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W/19/3232989

24 Maynard House, Dunmow Road, Great Easton, Dunmow, Essex CM6 2DL

- 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 R Good against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/19/0441/HHF, dated 22 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a second floor conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Maynard House is a modern three storey block of retirement apartments located within a retirement village set within extensive landscaped grounds. The building is constructed from red facing brickwork with a grey crown roof and dormer windows. Maynard House is set back a considerable distance from Dunmow Road, however, due to the size of the building and land levels it is nonetheless a prominent building.
4. No 24 is a second floor apartment and benefits from a roof terrace which faces open countryside on one side and a car park on the other. The terrace is bounded on two sides by the building with a parapet wall on the other sides.
5. The proposal would involve the erection of a conservatory on the existing roof terrace. The conservatory would be largely glazed and clad in dark stained weatherboarding. An outdoor area would be retained around the conservatory.
6. I acknowledge that the proposed conservatory would sit under the eaves of the main roof and would be set back into the corner of the roof terrace, partially obscured by the parapet walls. However, the overall height and size of the conservatory combined with the prominence of Maynard House would result in a highly visible structure from Dunmow Road, the approach to the building and from the surrounding countryside.
7. The amount of glazing and the use of dark stained weather boarding would not be in keeping with the design and materials of Maynard House. The materials

and colour proposed would result in an incongruous addition and would jar with the brick and grey roof of the existing building. As such the proposal would not relate well to the existing building or respect the design and external materials of Maynard House.

8. The proposal may make more efficient use of the building, provide additional surveillance opportunities and would not increase traffic flows. However, these factors weigh neither for nor against the proposal and do not outweigh the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.
9. I note that the appeal proposal is a revised scheme following two planning applications and a previous appeal decision¹. Nonetheless, every application and appeal must be considered on its own merits and I have found harm in relation to character and appearance.
10. Taking the above into account I therefore conclude that the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies H8 and GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) which, amongst other things requires new development to be compatible with the scale, design and materials of the original building and surrounding buildings. It would also fail to accord with paragraph 127 c) of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref APP/C1570/W/17/3081330