



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11th December 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W/17/3181330

24 Maynard House, Dunmow Road, Great Easton CM6 2DL.

- 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 and Mrs Roger Good against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/17/0852/HHF, dated 20 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is addition of single storey glass room with retractable roof to private roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Maynard House is a 3 storey block of modern retirement flats situated within the Moat Park retirement village, which has extensive landscaped grounds surrounding the buildings. Maynard House faces Dunmow Road and is quite prominent as the land falls significantly towards the road. It is a large red brick building with the top storey of flats located within its extensive grey pitched roofs. The roofscape has several small pitched roofed dormer windows and rooflights. Numerous skylights and solar panels are hidden behind the stepped pitched roofs on a central flat roof.
4. 24 Maynard House is a second floor flat with an existing roof terrace, which faces open countryside to the south-east and a car park and Moat Park's grounds to the south-west. No 24's roof terrace is bounded by pitched roofs to two sides, and brick walls to the other two sides. I observed during my site visit that no glass rooms or conservatories were evident at roof level at Maynard House.
5. The proposed development comprises a glass room which would provide a sheltered area set in from the roof terrace's boundaries to retain some entirely external space. The proposed development would be approximately 4.5m wide by 2.8m deep with frameless clear glass sliding doors enclosing the majority of the side and front elevations. Adjacent to the building, the side elevations of

the proposed glass room would terminate in white PVC infills. White aluminium support posts would be located at the proposed glass room's corners and along the edges of its mono-pitched roof structure. When retracted, the cream-coloured PVC fabric roof would fold back towards the roof's highest point. The top point of the proposed glass room adjacent to the existing building would terminate at approximately 2.8m from the proposed raised decking and approximately 3m from the existing floor of the roof terrace.

6. Though the proposed glass room would consist largely of glazed sliding doors, it would have an aluminium structure of a greater height at the highest point than Maynard House's existing roof. Despite the presence of skylights and solar panels close to the roof terrace and the proposed development being partially hidden from view by the pitches of the existing roof, part of the aluminium structure would remain visible in long views across the grounds and from the vehicular access to Moat Park from Dunmow Road.
7. Given its colour, overall height, and the shallow angle of the pitched retractable roof and roof support structure, the aluminium frame would remain noticeable even when the roof was retracted and would contrast with both the red brickwork and the grey roof tiles. The siting of the proposed development would also create an uncomfortable junction between the proposed development and the existing building. When taken together with its materials and colour, the juxtaposition of the proposed development and the existing building would highlight its incongruity. As such, the proposed development would fail to respect the scale, design and external materials of the existing building.
8. Furthermore, the pitch of the proposed development's roof would be at approximately 7 degrees, which would not reflect the steeper pitches of the surrounding roofs to the existing building. The appellants have confirmed that any alterations to the pitch of the proposed roof to match the existing building would result in either a reduction in the usable area of the structure due to inadequate height at the front or an increase in the height of the back wall plate. While I note that the appellants consider that the latter option would be more incongruous than the proposed development, neither of these options is before me in determining this appeal.
9. Though I note that the proposed development would be demountable, planning permission is required for this form of development. As such, I am required to consider the appeal on its merits.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed development would not prevent light reaching the remainder of the roof terrace or the adjacent windows and doors due to its glazed nature. It would also allow the appellants to use the roof terrace in all weather conditions year round, offering protection from both rain and sun. I concur with the appellants' view that it would not give rise to overlooking of other properties and would not be overlooked itself. While objectors have noted disruption from previous construction and refurbishment work at No 24, the appellants have confirmed that building works for the proposed development would be carried out with minimum disturbance to Maynard House's residents, and that it would be possible to remove the structure at the end of the tenancy. None of these issues alter my findings with regard to this appeal.
11. I also note that the shallow pitch of the proposed roof would ensure rainwater could run off into the built-in gutter system, which would allow for the

rainwater to be used. While the proposed development has permission from the Group Estates Director, and it would be durable, easy to use, and maintain, the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area is not mitigated by these positive aspects.

12. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to policies H8 and GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005), which state, amongst other things, that the scale, form, layout, appearance, design, and external materials of extensions should respect the original building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR