

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2017

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1750/D/17/3170894

19 Landscape View, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 4AT

- 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 Mart Patmore against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/16/2823/HHF, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as a front extension to provide a separate room, and an extension to the dining room, which at present serves as a walk through to the kitchen. The front and side brickwork will be of a red type brick to closely match the adjoining properties. The pitched roof will be of a tile to closely match the main roof tile, and the front door and windows to closely match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace dwelling situated in a primarily residential area. Within the surrounding area the dwellings vary in design but are predominantly 2-storey and sited to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped or used for parking. Some of the dwellings, including 17 and 23 Landscape View, which are the end properties of the short terrace within which the property is located, have been altered by the addition of side extensions. Some of the other dwellings within the area have front extensions but these are limited in size and are predominantly porches or other similar types of additions.
 4. The proposed development includes the erection of a mono-pitch front extension which the appellant claims is needed to provide accommodation to meet the health needs of family members. This accommodation could not be erected at the rear of the property due to limited amenity space. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Home Extensions* (SPD) does not preclude
-

front extensions subject to their impact on the appearance of the established streetscene and the type of dwelling. The evidence indicates that the Council would accept a smaller scale addition but this would not be of a size to meet the appellant's need for additional accommodation.

5. Although set back from the footway and partially screened by boundary vegetation, when viewed from the road the appeal scheme would be seen to project significantly from the property's front elevation. The proposed extension would also project well forward of the front elevations of both Nos. 17 and 21. By reason of scale and siting, the proposed extension would be a prominent and visually dominant addition which would be materially harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the form of the terrace. When viewed from the road, the incongruous siting and scale of the appeal scheme would be accentuated by the large mono pitch roof extending to just below the first floor windows. The proposed extension would not represent a high quality of design and would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene.
6. I have carefully considered whether the unacceptable harm which has been identified demonstrably and significantly outweighs the family circumstances of the appellant which has given rise to the need for additional accommodation. However, I am satisfied that the harm is such that it does outweigh these circumstances.
7. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it would conflict with Policies S1, GEN2 and H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan and the SPD. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings and for extensions to be of a scale and design to respect those of the original building. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR