



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2025

by Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/24/3351411

17 Wetherfield, Stansted, CM24 8JA

- 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 Alex Pope against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref is UTT/24/1043/HHF.
 - The development proposed is a two story side and rear extension, garage conversion with a new flat roof, entrance hall canopy and driveway to be enlarged for additional off street parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are: i) the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling house, the street scene and the surrounding locality; and ii) the adequacy of off street parking proposed, and the effect on traffic congestion and highway safety

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling constructed in the 1960's. The surrounding houses all vary in appearance due to the large number of extensions that have taken place and also the various external finishes (cladding, render, brickwork & hanging tiles). The appeal site, No.17, like others has a small single storey front entrance hall with a flat roof and garage. The garage has been joined to the house via a secure corridor and flat roof. The original garage has been divided into a workshop space and garage area; it was not adequate in size for modern cars to park comfortably and be able to exit/enter the vehicle from either side.

The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the original dwelling house, the street scene and the surrounding locality

4. The attached neighbouring property at no.18 has a two-storey side extension which is set back from the front elevation by about 1m. That set back makes the neighbouring extension subservient to the host dwelling. The appeal proposal carries the 2-storey side extension forward to line up with the front elevation of the dwelling. As such, the extension does not have a subordinate appearance and nor would it maintain the symmetry of the pair of houses. Whilst the area exhibits a variety of forms to the dwellings, this lack of subordination and symmetry

demonstrates poor design, which stands against local policy and that set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The proposed extension at the rear is not seen from the public domain and appears to be of a similar scale to that of its neighbour. I therefore consider that it is acceptable.
6. Turning to the front garage conversion and flat roofed entrance hall canopy, this involves retaining the structure of the existing workshop area and remnant garage and within it making an enlarged area as a home office, with a small storage area at the front. There would be no external change as a result of this element of the scheme. The entrance hall element would retain the same width across the front elevation of the house, but the structure containing the existing entrance hall and w.c. would be brought forward by about 1.5m along the 'garage' wall. The front of the 'garage' would project for about 1.5m beyond the new entrance.
7. I consider that this small change in the size of the projecting entrance hall would not look out of place on the existing house, and its visual effect is diminished by being set against the side wall of the garage. This contrasts with the situation on the neighbouring house at No.18 where the entrance hall projection stands forward of the front elevation of the house and the front of the garage. Taken with the variety of extensions and other changes to the houses within the immediate area, I conclude that the garage conversion and flat roofed entrance hall canopy is acceptable in its effect on the character and appearance of the original dwelling, the street scene and the surrounding locality.
8. Finally there is the matter of the adequacy of off street parking proposed, and the effect on traffic congestion and highway safety. The totality of the proposals for enlargement of the appeal property would see the existing 3 bedroom house become one with 4 bedrooms. Policy GEN8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan adopted in 2005 requires development to comply with the council's parking standards which would require 3 off-street parking spaces. Drawing No.2040-24.PL.001 dated April 2024 shows one parking spot diagonally on the enlarged driveway across the front of the curtilage. On the face of it, the illustration does not accurately reflect the number of cars that could be parked. There is 1 existing parking space in front of the garage, which would remain. It appears to me that the area available would indeed accommodate 3 cars, but in view of the decision that I am making on the appeal proposal as a whole, this is a matter that I need not pursue.

Overall conclusion

9. Whilst I have found that the proposed front garage conversion and flat roofed entrance hall canopy and the rear extension are acceptable, for the reasons that I have given in paragraph 4 above, in relation to the proposed 2-storey side extension, the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR