



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2022

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/22/3306681

112 Copse Hill, HARLOW, CM19 4PR

- 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 Dan Gladstone against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref HW/HSE/22/00233, dated 22 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is small front extension to first floor bedroom as shown on drawings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 112 Copse Hill (No 112) is a two storey detached house lying within an established residential area predominantly of two storey houses. The dwellings in the wider area are of varied design and many have been extended. However, they generally form groups of similar design and have strong building lines. Whilst some dwellings have been extended, the dwellings remain, for the most part, set back from the road with regard to their original building lines.
4. No 112 lies in a short cul-de-sac off the main length of Copse Hill. The dwellings within the cul-de-sac all exhibit a similar design with the original frontage composed of two two-storey elements. These are set on two, staggered building lines, with each element having a monopitch roof. For all of the dwellings within the cul-de-sac the element projecting forward of the other is that closest to the entrance to the cul-de-sac.
5. Some of the dwellings in the cul-de-sac have been extended. However, these retain the staggered form at second floor level and thus the cul-de-sac retains a high degree of uniformity in its built form fronting the street. This uniformity produces a rhythm of built form and harmonious design and this is a strong characteristic of the cul-de-sac.
6. The proposal would create an extension at first floor which project forward of the existing projecting half of the building frontage. This would reverse the existing arrangement, producing an incongruous feature, undermining the uniformity and out of keeping with the existing rhythm of the frontages that I have identified above, thus disrupting the pattern of the overall street scene. In

this instance that incongruity and disruption would constitute harm. That harm would be clearly visible to any passers by entering the cul-de-sac or passing on the main length of Copse Hill.

7. My attention has been drawn to other extensions in the surrounding area, and in particular to the neighbouring property at 113 Copse Hill (No 113). This dwelling has a single storey front extension, similar to that of No 112, but also has a two-storey side extension. In this case the extension is set back behind the staggered elements of the façade and has not altered the order in which they are set back from the road. The rhythmic built form is not undermined and therefore the extension of No 113 does not have the harmful impact which I have identified above or set precedent.
8. I have taken the opportunity to visit other cases of two storey extensions brought to my attention by the appellant. These extend the dwellings, but to the side, without projecting forward of the building line. My attention has been drawn to changes to the roof at 108 Copse Hill. This dwelling has a similar, staggered building line to No 112. A side extension has been added and, whilst this has resulted in changes to the form of the roof, the original staggered form of the front façade is still recognisable and contributes towards the rhythm of built form on that side of the cul-de-sac within which it sits. I have, in any case, determined this appeal on its own merits.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy PL1 of the Harlow Local Development Plan (2020) (the Local Plan), which expects a high standard of urban and architectural design for all development and requires development to meet certain criteria. These criteria include the protection, enhancement or improvement of local distinctiveness without restricting style and innovation, whilst taking account of local character and context and responding to the architectural detailing of the surrounding area and being visually attractive. Policy PL1, is closely compliant with the aims of Section 12 of the Framework
10. For similar reasons the proposal would also be contrary to the guidance provided within section 4.12 of the Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011), which relates to Residential Extensions, in as much as, in Principles DG47 advises that extensions should respect the features of the building to be extended, as well as the surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal fails.

I A Dyer

INSPECTOR