



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by Benjamin Clarke BA (Hons.) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday, 21 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/20/3253674

11 Victoria Gardens, Saffron Walden CB11 3AF

- 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 L. Kealey against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref: UTT/20/0208/HHF, dated 20 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side extension following demolition of existing garage and utility.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side extension following demolition of existing garage and utility at 11 Victoria Gardens, Saffron Walden CB11 3AF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: UTT/20/0208/HHF, dated 20 January 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 0719 PL-01 C; 0719 PL-02 A; 0719 PL-03 A; and 0719 PL-06 B.
 - 3) Prior to the commencement of any above ground works, full details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The Main Issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a detached dwelling located at the end of a cul-de-sac and is constructed with a rendered appearance that is supplemented by wood cladding. Adjacent to the front boundary of the site are several trees. The street contains many dwellings that are constructed to a variety of designs, utilising different materials.

4. Although the proposed extension would be relatively large, its design includes some architectural features that would give it a subordinate appearance. These include the lower height of the link between the original dwelling and extension, and the reduced height of the pitched roof section of the extension. These factors mean that the main feature of the site would be the existing dwelling and the proposed development would be a proportionate addition to the building.
5. In addition, the existing dwelling is relatively large and on a significantly sized plot. In result, the proposed extension would not have an excessive mass. It would also be viewed against a backdrop of a number of different buildings and dwelling types.
6. Although the appellant's dwelling does not feature any elements that have flat roofs, the building features a variety of different roof slopes. In addition, the surrounding area features a significant number of different roof shapes. I also note that within the vicinity of the appeal site, some dormer windows with flat roofs are also visible. In consequence, when the proposed extension is viewed against this varied context, it would not appear unduly incongruous.
7. Furthermore, owing to the positioning of the proposed extension, it would be well screened by the existing dwelling, whilst further screening would be provided by trees within the vicinity of the appeal site. These factors would be supplemented by the proposed extension being located on land that is notably higher than the road and is at the end of a cul-de-sac. This means that it would not be readily visible from the surrounding area. Accordingly, the proposed extension would not be a prominent addition to the building.
8. Due to the variety of materials used on the existing dwelling, the elevational treatments of the proposed extension would not impinge upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Whilst the proposed roofing materials would be divergent from the existing dwelling, the variety of materials present within the vicinity, combined with the lack of prominence of the extension means that it would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. Although the proposed extension would feature a variety of different types and sizes of windows, these would be viewed alongside the existing dwelling, which also features several different window designs. In consequence, this design approach would not appear unduly incongruous. Furthermore, the surrounding area features dwellings constructed to a variety of different designs and scales. As a result of this, different window designs are prevalent. In result, the proposed development would not erode any prevailing characteristic within the surrounding area.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development, in this regard, complies with Policies GEN2, H8 and S1 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that new developments are compatible with the character of the settlement; are compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings; and are of a scale, design and materials that respect the original building.

Conditions

11. I have given consideration to the conditions as suggested by the Council. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary in the interests of precision.
12. The Council has suggested a condition that requires the extension be constructed from materials that match the existing dwelling. However, the submitted plans show that some materials would differ. In order to ensure that the extension harmonises with its surroundings, a condition requiring the agreement of surface materials is necessary and reasonable. These materials would need to be agreed prior to any above ground works taking place.

Conclusion

13. For the preceding reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and planning permission granted.

Benjamin Clarke

INSPECTOR