



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2021

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/21/3273842

47 Russell Francis Way, Takeley, CM22 6FQ

- 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 Jeremy Howells against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/20/3273/HHF, dated 9 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey and two storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey and two storey rear extensions at 47 Russell Francis Way, Takeley, CM22 6FQ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref UTT/20/3273/HHF, dated 9 December 2020, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2007282.01, 2007282.02 & 20072882.03A.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the residential area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property lies within a small estate, where there is consistency in the general design and scale of housing but variety in individual properties and the form of the buildings when seen from front, side and rear. The side elevation of No. 47 can be seen from the south, where there is a staggered rear building line of the existing ground floor projection and the two storey and single storey projection of the attached No. 45, which extend beyond the rear building line of No. 47.

4. The proposed works would effectively fill in much of the area at ground and first floor that adjoins the rearward projection of No. 45. A dual pitch roof would be created to the rear of No. 47, which would sit next to the rear gable projection of No. 45. Whilst this would alter the appearance of the pair of houses, this would not have an intrusive effect on the character of the area. The extended property would remain a house of well-balanced proportions, with the rearward projection relating well to the main part of the house due to the set-down ridgeline, the dual pitched roof, and the relatively limited depth of the extension.
5. The overall impression would thus not be dominant to the area, where views of the works are generally limited to those from the south; such views would be across the grassed area, set back from the road. The extended house, and changed proportions of the building, would sit comfortably within the estate where – as noted earlier – there is currently variety in building form and detailing.
6. On the first main issue it is therefore my conclusion that the proposed development would not conflict with the objectives of Policies S3, GEN2 and H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 which, amongst other matters, aim to ensure new development, including residential extensions, is of a design compatible with the scale, form, layout and appearance of surrounding buildings, and the existing building to be extended. The development would also be consistent with the objectives of the Home Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2005, which seeks the highest standard of design in new development.

Living conditions

7. The proposed extensions would be kept behind the existing rear building line of the adjoining No. 45 at both ground and first floor. This means there would not be any overbearing impact upon the neighbour and, from what I have read and seen on site, no appreciable effect on levels of light or outlook. The position of windows in the proposed extension would not cause a loss of privacy to neighbours.
8. There have not been any objections to the proposed extensions from neighbouring residents and this reinforces my own conclusion on the second main issue that there would not be any harm to living conditions. Thus, the proposal would comply with Policies GEN2 and H8 of the Local Plan, and the provisions of the SPD, insofar as they seek to ensure development does not have a materially adverse effect on occupants.

Conclusions

9. The appeal is therefore allowed. I have attached a condition relating to materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development, and a condition specifying the approved plans in the interest of precision.

C J Leigh

INSPECTOR