

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2023

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/23/3328738

35 Roseacres, Takeley, Essex CM22 6QZ

- 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 Wayne Sell against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/23/1208/HHF, dated 9 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension and relocation of garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension and relocation of garage at 35 Roseacres, Takeley, Essex CM22 6QZ. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref UTT/23/1208/HHF, dated 9 May 2023, 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 and 5-23-2 Revision A (plans and elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow in a residential road of similar properties as well as two storey dwellings. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.
4. Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (2005) concerns design and requires development to be compatible with the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings; and for regard to be had to adopted supplementary guidance. Policy H8 of the Local Plan, concerning home

extensions, requires their scale, design and external materials to respect those of the original building. The *Home Extensions* Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) says that rear extensions should reflect the SPD's general guidance and that they should be in proportion to the scale of the existing dwelling.

5. The Council has not raised any concerns about the replacement of the conservatory by a single storey extension on a slightly larger footprint; or with the set back of the garage to accommodate this. I agree that these elements of the proposal would not have any harmful effects.
6. The appeal property has a prominent rear roof slope with a central dormer window. The proposal would result in a flat-roofed dormer spanning the full width of the property and of materially greater depth than the existing dormer. However, its height would not be significantly different to that of the existing dormer, so it would be set down from the main roof ridge.
7. The extension would not be visible from the public realm and so any effects would be apparent only from neighbouring gardens. From this perspective, the appeal building is not seen in isolation, but in relation to neighbouring properties. It is significant in this regard that two nearby dwellings, Nos 33 and 37, have the same form of extension proposed in this case; and the adjoining dwelling, No 36, has a full width box dormer across its rear roof slope. Consequently, the type of development proposed is a characteristic feature to the rear of this group of properties. Moreover, the extensions that have been undertaken are not of sufficient size or bulk that they appear as disproportionate additions to the host dwellings. This would also be the case with the appeal proposal, which is of similar design and size.
8. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policies GEN2 and H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan or with the SPD, described above.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should succeed. Of the Council's suggested conditions, I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of the proposal, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that a condition requiring external materials to match those of the existing dwelling is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR