



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/22/3294522

Tanglin Cottage, Main Street, East Hanney, Wantage OX12 0HX

- 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 and Mrs Mercer against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
 - The application Ref P21/V2835/HH, dated 4 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two bay detached car port style garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the East Hanney Conservation Area (the CA) and whether any harm to the significance of the CA is outbalanced by any public benefit.

Reasons

3. Tanglin Cottage is a large, two storey, semi-detached dwelling, with a sizeable front garden, set back from the carriageway and located within a generous plot. The existing large detached double garage is positioned slightly set back and to the side of the main building's front elevation. Its overall design, positioning and bulk reinforces its auxiliary status.
4. Tanglin Cottage is located within the CA. The CA, particularly along Main Street, is dominated by a predominance of detached or semi-detached rural cottages, mostly in residential use. Judging from their external appearance and the Conservation and Design consultation response, these cottages are of different ages and styles and developed organically along the historic route connecting the mill at the south of the village with the outlying farms to the north.
5. In addition to several 16 century and 17 century cottages and houses, some of which are located along Main Street and in relative proximity to the appeal site, the CA also includes some 18 century houses in georgian vernacular and later victorian houses.
6. The significance of the CA is therefore derived from its link to the area's agricultural past and the character and architectural interest provided by

existing historical buildings and their setting, particularly those linked to the area's farming past. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

7. The proposal is for the erection of a two bay detached car port style garage, which would be located to the front of the property, close to the site's boundary with Chestnut Cottage. Paragraph 200 of the Framework does state that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
8. Although Tanglin Cottage is not of specific historic or architectural interest, its sizable front garden does make a small, but positive, contribution to the green and open verdant character of the area. This, in my view, is linked to the significance of the CA insofar as it strengthens the rural, verdant and open character of the CA.
9. This is particularly the case for Tanglin Cottage as this sense of openness is further emphasised by the relatively wider grass highway verge located to the front of the appeal site, widening the road as one approaches the intersection with Snuggs Lane. Both Willow Cottage and Sunset View, on the opposite side of the street, also mirror this approach. The proposed development would, by its very nature, increase the overall built form within the site which would in turn reduce the overall amount of open space to the front of the appeal site. Consequently, the proposal would have an impact on openness.
10. I accept, as set in the Applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment (2022), that the proposal would have a limited footprint compared to the large existing dwelling and that there would be a significant amount of open space remaining at the front and side of the host property. I also accept that, although the proposed use of a traditional materials palette and a hipped roof, combined with some of the proposed open framed elements would reduce the impact and presence of the proposal.
11. Nevertheless, having visited the site and having considered the CGI Photo Montage (2021) submitted by the Applicant, I am not convinced that views of the proposed development would be restricted across the site or, more importantly, that the existing open character of the site, which contributes to the character and appearance of the CA, would not be reduced.
12. For all the foregoing reasons the proposed development would harm the significance of the CA by failing to preserve its character and appearance. The magnitude of this harm would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. In these circumstances, the Framework requires that, where a development proposal leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. No specific public benefits have been brought to my attention in relation to the proposed development, albeit I recognise there would be some; mostly economic and linked to the construction of the garage. However, as any such public benefits would be very modest given the small scale of the development, these would be substantially outweighed by the relatively significant harm

arising, bearing in mind the importance and protection given to designated heritage assets by statute and national and local planning policy.

14. The appeal proposal would not, therefore, preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CP37 and Policy DP36 of the Local Plan 2031 Part 2 – Detailed Policies and Additional Sites (2019), which seek to ensure that proposals conserve or enhance the special interest, character, setting and appearance of a Conservation Area and protect the significance of designated heritage assets, and Policy CP39 of the Local Plan 2031 part 1 – Strategic Sites and Policies (2016) which seeks to protect historic environments.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR