



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2021

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/21/3279704

The Saplings, 64A Bentfield Road, Stansted CM24 8HP

- 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 Tim Langer against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/21/1504/HHF, dated 2 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a glazed gable to the front elevation and two roof lights to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a glazed gable to the front elevation and two roof lights to the rear elevation at The Saplings, 64A Bentfield Road, Stansted, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/21/1504/HHF, dated 2 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years beginning with the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location and site plan 1038-21.PL.008; Existing and proposed ground floor plans 1038-21.PL.001; Existing and proposed first floor plans 1038-21.PL.002; Existing and proposed loft space plans 1038-21.PL.003; Existing and proposed roof plans 1038-21.PL.004; Existing and proposed front and rear elevations 1038-21.PL.005; Existing and proposed side elevations 1038-21.PL.006; and Existing and proposed flank elevations 1038-21.PL.007.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The Council's concern relates to the proposed forward facing glazed gable to the front elevation of the dwelling which would allow for increased headroom within the roof space. The dwelling is of a modern design and the new works would respect the original materials and continue the vertical glazing detail of the frontage. This new element would extend marginally above the main ridge and this relationship appears incongruous when viewing the southeast elevation drawing. However, the property is well screened in views from public
-

- vantage points and any views of the side elevation, that would have the unusual arrangement of roof forms, would be screened by the neighbouring dwelling.
4. The front elevation is visible from the road but only in filtered views beyond the large garden trees. The height of this new element above the main ridge would not be perceptible in these views and although the new gable would not be subservient, it would represent a feature to the frontage in keeping with the original design. The works would be built with high quality matching materials and the feature frontage would have a positive and distinctive appearance.
 5. Uttlesford Local Plan 2005 Policy GEN2 requires that development is compatible with the scale, form, layout and appearance and materials of surrounding buildings. Policy H8(a) requires that extensions are of a scale, design and of external materials that respect those of the original building. Policy S1 allows for development that is compatible with the character of the settlement. Whilst there would be some design inconsistencies, as there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the area or to the appearance of the house itself, I do not find conflict with these policy objectives.
 6. The proposal would conflict with a specific requirement of the Supplementary Planning Document – Home Extensions 2005 that an extension should not be higher than the original house. However, in other respects, the proposal would be acceptable, including the impact on neighbours and the quality of materials. As the purpose of the guidance is to protect the character of settlements, there is no conflict with its overall objectives. Similarly, whilst the National Planning Policy Framework seeks high quality design, these details do not result in any material harm but do provide for improved living conditions.
 7. Overall, the proposal has been designed to present a feature gable to the front of the property. It would be of high quality materials and would respect the modern appearance of the dwelling. It would have no impact on neighbouring properties and would not change the relationship of the property with the neighbouring conservation area. Although it includes an element that has a contrived arrangement of roof forms, as this would not be visible within the public realm or more generally, there would be no material harm or conflict with the design objectives overall. I therefore allow the appeal.
 8. I have imposed conditions with regard to the timetable for commencement and the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt. As the plans indicate that the materials would match, no further conditions are required.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR