
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by C Osgathorp BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/20/3246664

53 The Maltings, Great Dunmow CM6 1BY

- 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 Tom Butler against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/19/2667/HHF, dated 25 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and conservatory. New single storey rear and double storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing garage and conservatory, new single storey rear and double storey side extension at 53 The Maltings, Great Dunmow CM6 1BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/19/2667/HHF, dated 25 October 2019, 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: TM_001; TM_002; TM_003 revision B; and, TM_004 revision A.
 - 3) No construction works above ground floor slab level shall be carried out until details of the materials to be used for all the external finishes of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved materials.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house, which is designed with a pitched roof and gables to the front and rear. The external walls are finished in red brick at ground floor and black weatherboarding at upper floor level. It is located in an established residential area with houses of varying design and external materials.

4. I note the concerns from the Council regarding the width of the proposed 2 storey side extension, nevertheless it would be modest in depth and set back a sizeable distance from the front elevation of the dwelling. Taken together with the hipped roof design, and its set down from the ridgeline of the main roof, the proposed extension would be subordinate to the dwelling and would not appear dominant in the street scene. Furthermore, the extension would maintain an appropriate visual separation to the eastern side boundary, which would ensure that it would sit comfortably on the site and not appear cramped in relation to the neighbouring dwelling.
5. The proposed single storey rear extension would be subordinate to the dwelling and its mono-pitched roof design would integrate satisfactorily.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling. The proposal would therefore comply with saved Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005, which, amongst other things, seeks development that is compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings. It would also accord with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks well designed buildings and an appropriate visual relationship with the character and appearance of development in the surrounding area.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In order to maintain the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring details of the external surfaces of the development to be submitted to the Council for approval.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Osgathorp

INSPECTOR