



---

## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 July 2021

**by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI**

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

**Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> August 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/21/3269745**

**Park House, 56B North Street, Dunmow CM6 1BA**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mrs Shelia Stanley against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
  - The application Ref: UTT/20/3245/HHF, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is erection of single storey side extension and single storey side porch.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of single storey side extension and single storey side porch at Park House, 56B North Street, Dunmow CM6 1BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: UTT/20/3245/HHF, dated 1 December 2020, and the plans submitted with it, 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 strict accordance with the following approved drawings: 01-047\_010 Rev 0.0 Existing Site & Location Plan; 01-047\_015 Rev 0.0; 01-047\_100 Rev 0.0 Existing Floor Plans; 01-047\_120 Rev 0.0 Existing Roof Plan; 01-047\_130 Rev 0.0 Existing Elevations; Proposed Floor Plans 01-047\_200; Proposed Roof Plan 01-047\_220 Rev 0.0; Proposed Elevations 01-047\_230 Rev 0.0.
  - 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 building.

### Preliminary Matter

2. Since the Council's decision, a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. The new Framework echoes and reinforces policy relevant to the main issue in this case. I shall determine the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would a) preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Great Dunmow Conservation Area (CA), and b) preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building 'Ivy House' (Ref: 1067649) and Grade II\* listed 'Brook House' (Ref: 1076533).

## Reasons

4. The CA is focused around the historic spine of Great Dunmow town centre, which runs from Beaumont Hill, via North Street to High Street. From what I saw during my site visit and the evidence before me, the CA's significance, insofar as it relates to this appeal, lies in the historic townscape which reflects the town's evolution from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.
5. The listed buildings sit up-slope from the appeal property. Ivy House is a nineteenth century red brick and render house, set back modestly from and facing towards North Street. Brook House is a timber framed and plastered house fronting onto North Street, that dates from the sixteenth century, with eighteenth and nineteenth century alterations. The listed buildings' historic architecture has historic, evidential and aesthetic value. The intervisibility of the listed buildings' front facades and the North Street part of the CA's central spine contributes to the historic significance of the buildings and the CA.
6. Given the above, I consider the special interest of the listed buildings, insofar as it relates to this appeal, to be primarily associated with the historic legibility of their traditional Essex town centre architecture.
7. The appeal building is an early twenty first century, 'heritage style' detached house with render walls and tile roof, of relatively unostentatious appearance. It is situated towards the back of its plot, to the side of another detached house. The plot is located within a dip, down-slope from North Street's frontage. It is separated from the row of historic properties which fronts onto the eastern side of North Street, by garden space. The curving alignment of the access drive off North Street partly screens the front of the property. Located towards the eastern edge of the CA, the site adjoins a denser recent housing development.
8. As such, the appeal dwelling is a relatively visually contained and recent 'heritage style' house in a backland location at the edge of the CA, appreciably set back from the latter's main spine. There is not a historic cultural or functional relationship between the appeal building and the much older listed buildings. The above combination of factors limits the influence of the appeal property on the setting of the listed buildings, and the wider CA.
9. The proposal would entail a single-storey side extension towards its northern boundary wall and a porch on its other side, facing towards the neighbouring house.
10. The side extension's roof lights in its crown roof and its rear bifold doors would not be 'heritage' style elements. That said, they would be discretely located within the visually contained site. The weatherboarding would echo its use on various backland buildings within the CA. The crown roof forms would visually assimilate within the varied roofscape in the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, the low height of the single storey side and porch extensions, combined with brick and roof tiling to match the host building, would limit the proposal's prominence. Together the above would result in architecturally honest, unostentatious additions to the relatively discretely located and recently constructed building.
11. The architectural presence of the host building's core, two-storey detached mass with rear chimney would be maintained. Furthermore, the architectural

charisma and authority of the listed buildings and the CA's historic spine would endure.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a neutral effect on the setting of the listed buildings, and would preserve their significance. It would also preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, the proposal would accord with Policies ENV1, ENV2, GEN2, H8 and S1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan and guidance in the Essex Design Guide, which together seek to ensure that development complements local character and conserves the historic environment. Furthermore, the proposal would accord with the approach of the Framework, taking account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, with great weight given to the asset's conservation.

### **Conditions**

13. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered against the tests of the Framework and advice provided by Planning Practice Guidance. They have been found to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. A condition regarding materials is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

### **Conclusion**

14. The proposed development would adhere to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal succeeds.

*William Cooper*

INSPECTOR