
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2024

by David Reed BSc DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/W/23/3334257

39 Peaslands Road, Saffron Walden, Essex CB11 3ED

- 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 Mrs S Grace against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref UTT/22/3110/FUL, dated 11 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 no. dwelling with associated car parking and private gardens.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal is for a single dwelling adjacent to No 39 Peaslands Road, a semi-detached house on the corner of Bromfield and Peaslands Road which actually faces Bromfield. No 39 has an unusually large side garden as well as a rear garden, and this would be subdivided to create the extra plot. The side garden however extends out alongside the front garden of the adjacent semi-detached house, No 41, and as a result the proposal would be sited proud of the building line of Nos 17 to 63 on the northern side of Peaslands Road.
4. The proposal is designed with its main elevation facing Peaslands Road rather than Bromfield, two secondary elevations with fenestration facing up and down Peaslands Road and a 'rear' elevation facing the flank wall of No 39, linked to it at first floor level with the entrance door to the new property below.
5. The site is surrounded by a mature garden hedge and several large trees which provide some screening, and the intention to design a building with three public faces to reflect its position is appreciated. However, despite these factors, the building would appear as an incongruous feature in the wider street scene, projecting out from the line of dwellings on the northern side of Peaslands Road and into the otherwise spacious setting around the crossroads where Bromfield, Peaslands Road and Winstanley Road meet. In this one-off, idiosyncratic position the building would appear as a discordant and visually intrusive feature

in the layout of an otherwise conventional and pleasant residential area. This would be particularly true when seen approaching from the east.

6. The side extension to No 43 along the road, whilst unusually gable end to the front, conforms to the building line, and the contemporary dwelling No 24, whilst a standout design, lies well to the west and in line with the properties on either side. The other houses noted by the appellant, Nos 28, 30 and 32, also well to the west, are relatively prominent on rising ground but unremarkable as they form part of the normal pattern of houses lining the road.
7. A previous proposal for a bungalow on the site was refused permission in 2009¹. Whilst the current proposal would be for a building of two storeys, thus reflecting the form of nearby development, its position in front of the building line along Peaslands Road, which forms a strong and distinctive characteristic of the area, means that the introduction of the dwelling would be detrimental to the sense of place rather than a positive contribution towards it. The proposal does not therefore overcome the previous objections.
8. For these reasons the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the street scene in conflict with Policy GEN2 of the Uttlesford Local Plan 2005. This requires development to be compatible with the form and layout of surrounding buildings.

Conclusion

9. The housing land supply figure for the district is put at 3.11 years by the appellant and 4.50 years by the Council. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in paragraph 11 d) ii of the National Planning Policy Framework therefore applies. The need for housing is also clear from the most recent housing delivery test figure of just 58% of the requirement.
10. The proposal would provide a much needed two-bedroom dwelling which would make a useful contribution to local housing needs and have economic and social benefits for the town. The dwelling would be in a sustainable location close to a wide range of services and facilities, would be contained within an existing domestic garden, built of suitable materials, energy efficient, have acceptable access and car parking, would offer a good standard of amenity for its occupiers and not harm the living conditions of nearby residents. However, given the unique circumstances of this particular case the adverse impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene significantly and demonstrably outweighs the benefits.
11. Having regard to the above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Reed

INSPECTOR

¹ UTT/0690/09/FUL