



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2023

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/23/3326105

Shoemakers, Woodside Green, Great Hallingbury, Essex CM22 7UU

- 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 Rosemary Nugent against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/23/0625/HHF, dated 9 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is internal alterations and a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for internal alterations and a two storey side extension at Shoemakers, Woodside Green, Great Hallingbury, Essex CM22 7UU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/23/0625/HHF, dated 9 March 2023, 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: BRD/22/054/001, BRD/22/054/004, BRD/22/054/005 and BRD/22/054/006.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. Shoemakers is a detached cottage, on a large plot, in a fairly prominent position at the junction with Goose Lane. It has a rendered finish, and a mainly hipped roofed form, with gabled dormers at first floor set into its plain tile roof. It is not entirely clear from the evidence before me what constitutes the original building, but the property has clearly been extended at ground floor level to the side and rear. That extension has a gabled form, and is attached to the remainder of the cottage by a low link and a curved wall around the study.
4. The property sits amongst attractive surroundings comprising woods, open spaces, and scattered buildings with a diverse appearance, including a large

replacement dwelling with a full height glazed frontage, and a timber, brick and tile finish, at Vine Lodge to the north.

5. The Uttlesford Supplementary Planning Document – Home Extensions 2005 ('SPD') sets out, in broad terms, that extensions should respect the scale, height and proportions of the original house, and should be no higher or larger than it, having regard to the cumulative impact of previous extensions.
6. The proposal would occupy much the same footprint as the extension it would replace, albeit it would project slightly further to the north and the section of curved wall would be squared off. Whilst it would be taller and bulkier than the existing extension, its ridge would be set down slightly compared to the host's main ridgeline, and its single storey scale, with small gabled dormers set well within its expansive half-hipped steeply pitched roof, would respect the form and style of the rest of the building. It would be finished in matching materials and, contrary to the Council's assertion, no large crown roof is proposed.
7. The extension would also be shorter than the principal part of Shoemakers facing Goose Lane, and would be sited behind it, with a lower link ensuring a degree of separation, and a design break, between the two.
8. Consequently, whilst the Council maintains that the scheme would not appear subordinate to the original cottage, it would not overwhelm it. Moreover, in many regards its design and form would better reflect the remainder of the cottage compared to the slightly incoherent extensions it would replace. Whilst it would be clearly visible in the streetscene, it would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area.
9. Achieving subordinacy is not a requirement of Policies S7, GEN2 or H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005). They do however require extensions to respect the scale, design and external materials of the original building, to protect the character of the countryside, and to be compatible with the scale, form, layout, materials and appearance of surrounding buildings.
10. For the above reasons, the proposal would not conflict with those policies; nor with the guidance in the SPD; or with the requirement for good design in the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework').
11. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have considered those suggested by the Council against the Framework's tests. I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of good design, a matching materials condition is also necessary.
12. Summing up, the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the area. Having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is therefore allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR