The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

**by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 8 January 2021**

**Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/20/3260106**
**Highcroft, Keeres Green, Aythorpe Roding, CM6 1PQ**

- 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 Dr I Goosens against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
- The application Ref UTT/20/1922/HHF, dated 3 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 September 2020.
- The development proposed is demolish and rebuild garage, side and front porch extensions to dwelling.

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolish and rebuild garage, side and front porch extensions to dwelling at Highcroft, Keeres Green, Aythorpe Roding, CM6 1PQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/20/1922/HHF, dated 3 August 2020, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan and Block Plan Drawing No 06.19 KG 07 Rev A; Plans and Elevations of Front Extension Existing Drawing No 06.19 KG - 01; Plans and Elevations of Front Extension Proposed Drawing No 06.19 KG - 02 Rev C; Single Storey Front (Boot Room) and Side (Porch) Extensions Construction Details Drawing No 06.19 KG 04 Rev A; Proposed Plans and Elevations of Garage Drawing No 06.19 KG - 03 Rev B; Detached Garage Construction Details Sheet 1 of 2 Drawing No 06.19 KG 05 Rev A; and Detached Garage Construction Details Sheet 2 of 2 Drawing No 06.19 KG 06 Rev A.

   3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The Council raises no concern with the proposed extensions to the dwelling and I see no reason to disagree. These comprise the erection of a pitched roof porch to the front of the dwelling and a modest extension to an existing porch

on a side elevation. Subject to the use of matching materials, the design and scale of the proposed extensions are compatible with the host property.

4. The proposed garage would be located to the south eastern corner of the plot and would occupy the position of the existing garage but extend further towards the rear of the site. The resultant building would be more than double the footprint of the existing garage. It would have a pitched roof with the gable ends facing the front and rear of the site. Three dormer windows are proposed to the roof slope facing into the host property's garden area. Access to the proposed storage area within the roof space would be via an external staircase situated at the rear of the building.

5. The dormer windows and external staircase are features that closely follow the design of the neighbouring property's garage, which is situated alongside the shared boundary and forward of the proposed position of the appeal garage. Dormer windows are also seen on other domestic outbuildings in the surrounding area and would not therefore appear as an alien feature in their surroundings. The scale and design of the proposed dormer windows are in keeping with the scale of the roofslope and building on which they would sit.

6. Although the overall scale of the proposed garage would be much greater than the existing garage, particularly in relation to its depth and footprint, because of its single storey nature and its position within the site, it would not be overly prominent within the street scene. Any views would be in the context of the existing buildings, whereby the proposed garage would not be seen as out of keeping in terms of scale. It would be contained within the existing site boundaries and it would not result in any significant loss of garden area. As such it would not dominate the site or the dwelling that it would serve. The use of materials to match the existing dwelling would ensure that the proposed garage would be well related to and compatible with the dwelling. The building would be of a suitable size to serve the desired purpose of garaging for a few vehicles and the provision of domestic workshop and storage space.

7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site or surrounding area. Thus, it would be consistent with Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005, which seeks to ensure good quality design, including compatibility of new development with the scale and layout of surrounding buildings. It would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good quality design and new development to be sympathetic to local character.

**Conditions**

8. The Council has suggested conditions that it considers would be appropriate. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area, I have imposed a condition requiring matching external materials.

**Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

*S Tudhope* Inspector