



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Jonathan Hockley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/19/3242119

Field View, 179 High Street, Yelling PE19 6SB

- 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 Ms Lu Dai against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01440/HHFUL, dated 15 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new garage at 179 Field View High Street, Yelling PE19 6SB in accordance with the terms of application Ref 19/01440/HHFUL, dated 15 July 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: YL.179HS.P01 A, YL.179HS.P02 A.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing host dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the setting of a grade II listed building and whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Yelling Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site relates to a two-storey, brick-built, detached dwelling, located within the setting of a grade II listed barn, in the Yelling Conservation Area (CA). The appeal dwelling along with its adjoining dwelling located to the west have been built recently, following demolition of a former dwelling which had
-

its frontage close to the road. The recent development is well set-back from the road; both dwellings have single storey gable elements to the front, private drives and open space to the front/side.

5. The proposal seeks the construction of a detached pitched roofed double garage to the front of the appeal dwelling. The garage would be set-back from the road, next to the western side boundary. Its width would not exceed that of the existing single storey front gable; thus, it would not project further towards the eastern side boundary, where the listed barn is located, than the existing front gable.
6. Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) require me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area and preserving the setting of the listed building. In this respect national policy on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of the heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
7. The Yelling CA is largely a linear area, based around and centred on the High Street. There a range of properties and a mix of old and new houses along High Street. The buildings vary in terms of scale, design and siting in relation to the road, as some of them sit very close to the road, such as the listed barn, whereas some are more set back. Some of the properties set back from the road have outbuildings/garages to the front, which sit closer to the highway verge. The character of the CA is added to significantly by mature trees and landscaping. The listed barn dates from the late 17th century and is constructed of red brick with a pantiled roof and weatherboarded gable ends. The barn is simply detailed with a large opening on its eastern elevation and two small windows/openings on its western side facing the appeal site. Former openings on this side appear to have been bricked up. The significance of the barn arises primarily from its age and vernacular nature.
8. As defined within the Framework, the setting of a heritage asset is the surroundings in which the heritage asset is experienced. In this case, the significance of the listed barn can be most readily appreciated from the land immediately surrounding the building, particularly when viewed from High Street from both west and east directions. Photographic evidence provided by the appellant shows that previously the public view of the barn from the western side of High Street was limited by the presence of the former dwelling.
9. Given the significant set-back of the appeal property from the road, the surroundings from which the listed barn is experienced are reasonably extensive. From a shorter distance the barn is viewed from both directions within the context of the group of buildings with which it shares the plot. The context in which the barn is viewed from a larger distance, from further west on the High Street, is different as the road is slightly curved and it has trees and other vegetation on its northern side. These trees, on the south end of Friends Close soften the view of the barn and the slight curvature of the road would mean that the proposed garage would only be fleetingly glimpsed from this angle.

10. Therefore, whilst the garage would clearly be sited in the surroundings in which the listed barn is experienced, it would only occupy part of the existing open space to the front of the host dwelling and the siting and positioning of the proposal would be sufficiently set-back from the road and set-in from the eastern side boundary, as to not affect this setting adversely. Moreover, given the single storey nature of the garage, from a shorter distance the barn would continue to be experienced in the context of the group of the buildings from which is part of, and the proposal would not be prominent or obtrusive. Furthermore, given the scale, form, matching materials and siting, it would not appear out of context within the street scene or the wider CA. Accordingly, the development would have a neutral impact on the significance of the heritage assets and the ability to appreciate them.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would not have a harmful impact on the setting and therefore the significance of the listed building. The proposal would comply with the Act. Moreover, the development would not conflict with the aims of Policies LP11, LP12, and LP34 of the Huntingdonshire's Local Plan to 2036, which collectively require, amongst other things, that development is well designed and conserves or enhances heritage assets and their settings. Whilst the scheme would not fully accord with the advice in the Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document-2017, each case must be considered on its own merits and based on the circumstances of this site, the settlement, and the appeal proposal before me, I conclude that the garage would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would be in accordance with the development plan.

Conditions and Recommendation

12. In the interests of proper planning and to provide certainty I have recommended the standard time limit condition and have specified the approved plans. In order to protect the character and appearance of the CA a condition that specifies that matching materials to the host dwelling are used in the development is necessary. These conditions have also been suggested by the Council in the event that the appeal was allowed, although the materials conditions has been slightly amended to ensure it relates to the host dwelling.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to these conditions.

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

J Hockley

INSPECTOR