
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/16/3160236

48 Long Horse Croft, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 4BJ

- 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 Sophie Bromley against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/16/1746/HHF was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider streetscene; and

whether sufficient information is available to assess the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to parking provision.

Reasons

3. At the time of my site visit, the proposed extension was partially constructed at ground floor level.

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a modern two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a recent rear single-storey extension. The property lies within a modern residential estate and pedestrian access is via an alleyway, which I note is a private alleyway linking Long Horse Croft to Cromwell Road.
 5. Guidance in Uttlesford District Council's Supplementary Planning Document - Home Extensions (SPD) (2005) states that extensions should respect the scale, height and proportions of the original house.
 6. The Council has stated that the original dwelling is some 5.4m in width with a footprint of approximately 37.8m². The proposed side extension would be
-

some 4.5m in width. It would include a suspended first floor and would be set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling.

7. The cumulative additions in footprint of the proposed extension and the recently constructed rear extension would amount to approximately some 37.36m². From my observations, these cumulative additions would overwhelm the character and appearance of the original dwelling. They would not respect the scale and proportions of the original house. In addition, even taking into account the amount of private amenity space that would remain, due to the scale, width, design and position of the proposed side extension; I consider that it would appear cramped in this irregular shaped site and therefore result in over development of the site.
8. I note the previous planning permission in 2010 for a two-storey side extension. However, I agree with the Council that the design of that proposal less imposing and more in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling than the proposal before me. In addition, having been granted planning permission prior to the more recent single-storey extension, it would not have created the cumulative harm that I have identified above.
9. In reaching my conclusion on this matter, I have had regard to all matters raised. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. Whilst I note that the proposal would be visible from the alleyway, (which I understand to be private), it would be visible to some extent from public view in Cromwell Road. Due to the harm I have identified above, I consider that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.

Parking Provision

10. The Uttlesford Local Parking Standards (February 2013) require three parking spaces for a four bedroom dwelling. In this densely developed area, there are limited opportunities for additional on street parking. Therefore, in the interest of highway safety, I see no clear reason to relax these standards for new development in this locality.
11. At my site visit, I noted that there is a dedicated parking space for the appeal property at the front, a parking space within the appeal site to the rear and that the appellant parks in front of the former garage at the rear. That parking space is outside the appeal site and it is unclear from the representations whether this is a dedicated space for the occupiers of the appeal premises. I do consider that converting the former garage back to a garage for parking is unlikely, as the garage door opening has been bricked up.
12. From the evidence before me, it is not clear whether there are three dedicated parking spaces for the occupiers of the appeal premises. This lack of information adds to my concerns and has led me to conclude on this matter that in the absence of such information, the proposal would have an adverse effect on highway safety.

Conclusion

13. I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider streetscene and in the absence of sufficient information, the proposal would have an adverse effect on

highway safety. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in SPD and would not accord with Local Parking Standards. In addition, it would be contrary to Policies S1, GEN2, H8 and GEN8 in the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) where they seek to ensure that new development is compatible with the character of the area, where the scale of extensions and their design respect those of the original building and where they seek to ensure sufficient parking provision.

14. I consider the policies referred to above are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design; and Framework policies with regard to highway safety.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR