



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2025

by Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1570/W/24/3352957

6 Hill Road, Great Sampford, CB10 2RT

- 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 Mr and Mrs Godbole, HRG Property Investments Limited, against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
- The application Ref is UTT/23/0937/FUL.
- The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. dwelling at 6 Hill Road to the north of the existing dwelling, formation of a new vehicular access and piping and backfilling of front ditch (Phase 2 of development proposals).

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1570/W/24/3352958

6 Hill Road, Great Sampford, CB10 2RT

- 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 Mr and Mrs Godbole, HRG Property Investments Limited, against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref is UTT/23/0938/FUL
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. dwelling at 6 Hill Road to the south of the existing dwelling, formation of a new vehicular access and piping and backfilling of front ditch (Phase 3 of development proposals).
-

Decision

Appeal A Reference APP/C1570/W/24/3352957

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B Reference APP/C1570/W/24/3352958

2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

3. As set out above, there are two appeals relating to proposals for very similar two story dwellings. Both appeals are on the same site which contains an existing bungalow situated close to the middle of the land. The two appeal dwellings are proposed on each side of the existing dwelling. Appeal A is to the north of the bungalow and appeal B on the southern side of the land. The plans for the two appeals also show the existing dwelling being subject to an application for extensions and alterations. That is not a matter that is included in these appeals, but it appears that the intention is that there would be three houses on the site of very similar appearance. To avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two appeals

together, except where otherwise indicated, since the refusal reasons are identical in both cases.

Main Issue

4. There is no objection from the council to the principle of the development of the land by 2 additional dwellings, so that the main issue in both cases is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the established streetscene, taking account of the size of the dwellings in the street and those proposed.

Reasons

5. The appeal sites are located on the eastern side of Hill Road south of, and just outside, the development boundary limits of the village of Great Sampford. The site currently contains a detached bungalow. The site is on a slope, with the road to the front at a lower level than the dwelling. The site of appeal A is between a telephone exchange to the north, and the existing detached bungalow. The site of appeal B is to the south of the bungalow, and is followed by a water company access and open countryside.
6. The dwellings in Hill Road are generally set back consistently from the highway with spaces between them being a characteristic of the streetscene. The telephone exchange immediately to the north of the site of appeal A, has two gabled roofs, the roof next to the site being higher. Next to the telephone exchange are 2 small bungalows, followed by 2 chalet bungalows, beyond which is the beginning of the village. On the opposite side of Hill Road from the appeal site, is a large recently constructed detached dwelling in chalet form ('Meadow View'). North of this, towards the village, is another bungalow followed by open pastureland.
7. There was a proposal for the exiting bungalow on the land to be redeveloped in the same fashion as the 2 appeal proposals. However, that was refused, but there has subsequently been a decision by the council for an extension that meets the criteria as set out in Schedule 2, Part 1, Class, AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). This decision was that prior approval and an application for planning permission are not required. At the time of my visit, this development had not been carried out. A drawing at Appendix g of the appellant's statement of case shows the front elevation of this scheme, with a ridge height at 82.31m.
8. The appellant's Appendix d shows the ridge heights of all the buildings that have been mentioned. Beginning to the north, just outside the village, the 2 chalet bungalows have ridges at 77.59m and 77.69m. The 2 bungalows next to the telephone exchange have ridges at 76.43m and 76.9m. The telephone exchange has the ridge of its highest roof at 78.51m, whilst the permitted development enlargement of No.6 Hill Road is shown with a ridge at 81.83m, raised from the existing 79.91m.¹ Opposite the site, the newly built Meadow View has a ridge height at 83.02m.
9. The fact is that the height and mass of Meadow View is not seen in the same relationship as the appeal proposals and the existing development on the eastern side of the road. Meadow View is at a significantly greater scale than the pre-

¹ I note the discrepancy between this figure and that quoted in paragraph 7.

existing bungalow, that I understand it was intended to replace, but the present situation illustrates a discordance that is not satisfactory. The presence of Meadow View does not support the proposals of the 2 appeals.

10. A useful drawing in making a judgement on the 2 appeal proposals is Drawing No. RMDS/HR/2006A which shows the 2 appeal dwellings (together with the originally intended replacement for No.6) in the context of the telephone exchange. This has the title 'Proposed Street Scene (Master Version)². The appeal A dwelling is shown with a ridge height of 80.28m, the appeal B dwelling with a height of 81.13m, and the previously proposed redevelopment of the existing bungalow also with a height of 81.13m (a little lower than the PD proposal at 81.83m). The difference in height of the proposed appeal A dwelling compared with the telephone exchange maximum height 78.51m is clearly illustrated, as is the greater general scale of the 2 appeal proposals.
11. The design of the 2 appeal dwellings is in the form of 1½ storey houses, with 2 gabled dormers rising from the main front elevation through the eaves, rather than as separate windows set into the roof slope. This design has a greater impact than traditional dormers, adding to the scale and mass of the proposal.
12. It is not just the greater height, but the scale and mass of the 2 proposals that is decisive. Having considered all matters raised, I have come to the conclusion that they would not be in keeping with the existing streetscene as they would be visually dominant and intrusive. This does not amount to good design, fails to accord with Policy GEN2 of the adopted Uttlesford Local Plan, the Essex Design Guide, and the NPPF. Therefore both appeals will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR

² I have also been supplied with a version No. RMDS/HR/2006 which I understand has not been seen by the council. This version shows slightly higher ridge level for the Appeal b proposal. I have not taken this drawing into account.