
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2020

by David Wallis BSc (HONS) PG DipEP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/W/19/3242478
56 Fullers Mead, Harlow CM17 9AS

- 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 Kamil Cholewinski against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref HW/HSE/19/00330, dated 13 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey and single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey and single storey rear extension, single storey side extension and front porch at 56 Fullers Mead, Harlow CM17 9AS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HW/HSE/19/00330, dated 13 August 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 050 Location Plan, 051 Proposed Site Plan, 100 Rev A Existing Plans and Elevations, 101 Rev A Proposed Plans and Elevations, 102 Rev A Ground and First Floor 3D Visual Plan and 103 Rev A External Views 3D Visual Plan.
 - 3) Demolition or construction works shall take place only between 0830 and 1700 on Monday to Friday and shall not take place at any time on Saturdays, Sundays or on Bank or Public Holidays.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal applied for was varied during the course of the application, giving rise to an amended description being agreed between the parties. The description in the header above reflects this revised description as it appears on the decision notice and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Fullers Mead consists of two storey terraced dwellings, predominantly constructed of brick although a proportion of properties have a band of render at first floor level. Dwellings are set back from the highway varying distances with only a limited number able to park cars on their frontages. In other cases, the frontage is laid to lawn. Most properties have a porch or other form of canopy on their front elevations, constructed in various materials.
5. The appeal site is an end of terrace dwelling with a concrete path and loose-stone finish to the front garden. At the time of my visit, a car was parked on the frontage but not obstructing the path to the front door. Immediately to the west is a large complex of single storey garages in a courtyard form. The rear garden of the appeal site is separated from this courtyard by a close-boarded fence and hedgerows.
6. Although the particular terrace that the appeal site forms part of does not have porches in its front façade, the wider estate contains an eclectic mix of porch types and styles. The presence of these other examples leads me to conclude that they are a prevailing feature of the area, and certainly a porch at the appeal site would not appear alien in the street scene. Its proposed position within the façade would not compromise the ability to park cars on the site's frontage.
7. It is a common characteristic in the estate for porches to be of different materials rather than brickwork to distinguish them as additions to their properties. The proposed porch would be rendered but the remainder of the front elevation would be brickwork, consistent with the rest of the terrace facing the street scene. In this respect the use of render would not be out of keeping with the area.
8. The proposed rear extension would incorporate large sections of render, although this is exclusively on the southern elevation. The western flank, to which public views are afforded from the garage court, would be brickwork matching the terrace. Given that there are bands of render designed into some of the street facing elevations of surrounding terraces, the proposed use of render in this instance would not be intrusive or incongruous.
9. The proposed extensions would occupy a large footprint in comparison to the original dwelling. However, the proposed design would incorporate varying roof heights, roof pitches and materials which break up and articulate the proportions of the development. The two-storey element would be set away from the side boundaries and would be seen in the context of the proposed single storey elements. It would not be visible from the highway of Fullers Mead and, although visible from within the garage court to the west, would not be prominent or dominating in form or appearance.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area nor upon the integrity of the host terrace. The proposal would be in accordance with policy BE1 of the Adopted Harlow Replacement Local Plan and the Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, which state that building design should be specific to the site and its context, respecting whilst not necessarily replicating local characteristics.

Other Matters

11. The two-storey element would be separated from the appeal site boundaries by single storey extensions and would have a lower ridge height than the original dwelling. The development would not therefore result in adverse impacts on the living conditions of adjacent occupiers by way of a loss of outlook or light.
12. I am unaware of any circumstances whereby normal refuse collection methods or processes would be prejudiced by the proposal. Equally, there is no evidence before me to suggest the dwelling, as extended, would become a House in Multiple Occupation and indeed such a proposal is not before me.
13. I acknowledge that this is a dense residential area and this part of Fullers Mead is a quiet crescent. It is therefore appropriate to control construction works to avoid undue noise and disturbance upon nearby occupiers.

Conditions

14. I have attached conditions regarding the time limit for commencement and ensuring the approved plans are adhered to, for certainty as to the development hereby permitted.
15. It is also necessary and reasonable to attach a condition regarding construction hours in view of the sensitive nature of the surrounding residential environment.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons above, the appeal is allowed.

David Wallis

INSPECTOR