



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 August 2024

by L Reid BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/24/3338923

129 Markwell Wood, Harlow, Essex CM19 5QU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Konstantinou against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref is HW/HSE/23/00507.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 129 Markwell Wood, Harlow, Essex CM19 5QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HW/HSE/23/00507, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TQRQM23216022440396 – Site Location Plan, KON.JUL.23A Page 1 of 2, KON.JUL.23A Page 2 of 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey terraced house. It has a small forward projection and a single storey side projection. The roof of the side projection is connected to the roof of the garage at the neighbouring property creating an undercroft structure that provides access to a parking area. This results in a visible gap between the houses. The undercroft design feature is repeated at other terraces in the street scene. The surrounding area is residential in character.
4. The proposed first floor side extension would be built over the existing side projection with a similar width and depth. As a result of this, it would have a relatively modest scale that would relate well to the proportions of the house. Although it would sit forward of the first floor level, the front building line of the terrace is already disrupted by the front projections at some of the properties.
5. The extension would be set slightly back from the forward projection and would be set down from the roof ridge. It would therefore read as a subservient

addition to the house, and it would not be visually dominant or unduly prominent. Overall, the design of the extension would accord with the appearance of the house.

6. By virtue of the size of the extension, sufficient space would remain between the house and the connected property with a degree of visual separation. The extension would also not extend over the middle part of the undercroft feature. This would ensure that the undercroft continues to read as a key architectural feature in the street scene. Whilst I accept that first floor extensions are not common, because of its design, the extension would integrate well within the street scene and would not result in such a change that detrimentally disrupts the rhythm of form or consistency of development on the road or in the wider area.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it complies with Policy PL1 of the Harlow Local Development Plan 2020, the Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 and the Harlow Design Guide Addendum Supplementary Planning Document 2021. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, require extensions to be coherent, visually subservient and take account of local character and context.

Conditions

8. I have imposed the statutory implementation condition, along with a condition listing the approved plans to provide certainty. A materials condition is also necessary to ensure the external materials of the proposal match the existing materials to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

L Reid

INSPECTOR