
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2021

by R Bartlett PGDIP URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/20/3263249

4 Rosemary Close, Dunmow, CM6 1DP

- 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 Nathan Shelock against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/20/1763/HHF, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Rosemary Close is a small cul-de-sac comprising 6 pairs of two-storey, semi-detached houses with large rear gardens. Despite many of the properties having been altered and extended over time, the pairs of houses remain generously spaced apart. The space between the pairs of dwellings is a strong and positive characteristic of the area.
4. I observed during my site visit that other two-storey side extensions in Rosemary Close are generally set further back from the original front elevation than the proposal before me would be. These other extensions also retain large open gaps between properties, particularly at the first floor level and above. Although No. 9 Rosemary Close has a large two-storey side extension, which is only very slightly set down and set back from the roof line and original front elevation, this property is situated on a very wide plot, adjacent to the head of the cul-de-sac. Consequently, the side extension at No. 9 does not fill a gap between dwellings and significant space is retained between the side of the extension and the side boundary of the plot.
5. In contrast to this, No. 5 Rosemary Close has already been extended, in part, up to the boundary of the appeal site at two-storey level. The proposed extension to No. 4 would also, in part, extend up to the boundary at two-storey level. Despite the staggered building lines and ridge heights, the proposed

extension would close the remaining gap between the dwellings and as a result would harmfully detract from one of the key characteristics of the street scene.

6. The appellant has pointed out errors in the council's report, which I have had regard to. My attention has also been brought to a pair of two-storey side extensions on Windmill Close, Dunmow. However, these extensions are not within the immediate vicinity of the area and do not detract from the key issue, which is the character and appearance of Rosemary Close.
7. The proposal would therefore conflict with policy GEN2(a) of the Uttlesford Local Plan (January 2005) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which require amongst other things, that new development is compatible with the layout of surrounding buildings and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR