
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2022

by Nichola Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/22/3299058

30 Church Lane, Tilbrook, Huntingdon PE28 0JS

- 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 Darren Pescod against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02478/HHFUL, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is side extension replacing existing outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the Tilbrook Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached 2 storey brick dwelling with 2 gables to the front elevation. The site is located at the end of Church Lane within the Tilbrook Conservation Area. A brick wall surrounds the appeal property to the front and side and forms a clear demarcation between the residential street and the nearby open space. The significance of the conservation area appears to lie in the mixed character of the dwellings which demonstrate the piecemeal development of a small rural village such that the form and layout of houses are a key influence on its character and appearance.
4. Dwellings are generally set back from the highway, contributing to a sense of space and openness in the area. The appeal property is set back further in the plot than the neighbouring dwelling, 26 Church Lane. Thus, when viewed from the northern part of Church Lane and the church yard the character of the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
5. The proposal would comprise a part single, part two storey extension which would match the ridge height of the two existing gables, projecting forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling. The forward projection of the extension, in combination with its height and width, would create a prominent form of development which would dominate the host property and the wider street scene, contrary to the spacious character of the area. This prominence would be exacerbated through the use of contrasting materials. Despite the proposal incorporating a lower eaves height than the existing gables, not

projecting any further forward than the neighbouring property and the visual separation afforded by the single storey link, the proposal would clearly read as a large and dominant extension to the appeal property.

6. The proposed extension would contrast in form and materials with other properties in the area, including various other garages that have been referred to by the appellant, and would appear as an incongruous addition to the Tilbrook Conservation Area, in particular in views of the appeal site from the northern part of Church Lane and the church yard. Whilst the proposed extension would be unlikely to impact on distant views looking north along Church Lane, nonetheless, the proposed extension would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the Tilbrook Conservation Area as a whole and would thereby detract from the significance of this heritage asset. The proposal would result in "less than substantial" harm and no public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
7. I have been referred to some other cases for extensions and garages, but these are in other settlements that would likely have a different character and appearance. They do not, therefore, lead me away from my findings on this case. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the area and the Tilbrook Conservation Area and would harm its significance. Accordingly, I find conflict with those aims of policies LP11, LP12 and LP34 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan 2019 and the Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017, which seek to ensure that proposals are well designed and respond positively to their context and protect the significance of designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given the proposal conflicts with the development plan. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the proposal is unacceptable, and the appeal does not succeed.

Nichola Robinson

INSPECTOR