

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2022

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/21/3281166

Hill House, Wrights Green Lane, Little Hallingbury CM22 7RL

- 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 Liam Kiernan against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref: UTT/21/1160/HHF, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing garage, a new garage and a two-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the demolition of an existing garage, a new garage and a two-storey side and rear extension at Hill House, Wrights Green Lane, Little Hallingbury, CM22 7RL in accordance with the terms of application UTT/21/1160/HHF, dated 1 April 2021, and subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BRD/20/093/001; BRD/20/093/002 and BRD/20/093/003.

Procedural Matter

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. As part of the determination of this appeal, I afforded the main parties an opportunity to comment upon the implications of this change for the purposes of determining this appeal. I have determined this appeal in accordance with the relevant parts of the development plan including the Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the original building.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Hill house is a detached two-storey dwelling with a gabled front to part of it. It is rendered in a cream colour and has a red pantile roof.
5. Like the neighbouring properties, it is set well back from Wrights Green Lane and has a private driveway. Its front amenity area, again like the neighbouring properties, gives the appeal building and the area generally a mature landscaped appearance with many trees in a low density setting.
6. Properties in the immediate area are of various designs with few common characteristics, though with a preponderance of double pitched roofs, some hipped and some gabled. Properties are mainly one or two storeys in height.
7. The proposed extension would add a second gable to the front of the property, and thus there would then be one to either side with a recessed porch between. It would give the elevation a more symmetrical character than its existing appearance.
8. On my site visit, I noted that the neighbouring property known as 'Garwood', also has a double, two-storey gable front elevation and which the appellant notes was originally a single storey property. Both Garwood and the property on the other side of the appeal building, known as 'Amesbury', are large buildings. I do not disagree with the Council's officer report that *'taking these dwellings into consideration it is accepted that a large replacement dwelling could be supported in this location'*, though I note that the proposed development is for an extension as opposed to a replacement dwelling.
9. While the proposed extension would not be set back from the front of the existing building, I consider that the proposed extension would not detract from its overall character and appearance. By creating a more symmetrical appearance to its front elevation, it would add to its design quality, especially when viewed from the public vantage point of Wrights Green Lane. I find that the proposed development, in all other respects relating to its scale, form and design, would not detract from the character and appearance of the original building.
10. Policy H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 (LP) states that extensions will be permitted if their scale, design and external materials respect those of the original building. Policy GEN2 of the LP, amongst other things, has the same aim. Chapter 12 of the Framework stresses the need for good design. Policy S3 of the LP refers to 'other development limits' and is not pertinent to the impact of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the original dwelling.
11. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of design including the use of external materials, and no harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the original building. The proposal would therefore accord with the character, appearance and design requirements of policies H8 and GEN2 of the LP, and with the Framework.

Planning conditions

12. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR