



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2025

by A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/25/3359536

32 Highfields, Dunmow CM6 1ED

- 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 Adam Frost against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref is UTT/24/2070/HHF.
 - The development proposed is described as: Proposed two storey side & rear addition
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed two storey side & rear addition at 32 Highfields, Dunmow CM6 1ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/24/2070/HHF, 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: 6094/01, 6094/03 Rev D, 6094/07 Rev C and 6094/06 Rev D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The submitted floor plan 6094/07 Rev C shows a 1m gap between the extension and the boundary, in addition the elevation drawing 6094/06 Rev D also shows a similar gap to the boundary. With these being the drawings refused by the Council I accept the revised block plan of 6094/03 Rev D, as this too shows the 1m gap to the boundary line.
3. It is noted within the Delegated Officer Report that it states no significant material harm to neighbouring amenity, the conclusion that states there would be harm to neighbouring amenity and the decision notice that makes no reference to neighbours' amenity. Given, no argument has been put forward by the Council regarding neighbouring amenity I have determined that this is not a point of conflict or a main issue in this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area and host dwelling.

Reasons

5. The dwelling forms one half of two semi-detached dwellings. The architectural style of these dwellings is common within the street, with some of them having two storey extensions built to the boundary line including the dwelling (no.29) opposite.
6. The Council states in the case officer report that the proposal would be subservient and sympathetic to the host dwelling. This view is agreed given the significant set back from the existing front elevation and set down of the proposed roof to the existing ridge height.
7. With the multiple examples within the street scene of similar extensions, it is not considered that substantial visual breaks between dwellings is a defining characteristic of the area. On this basis the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the street scene.
8. The proposal is subservient and sympathetic to the host dwelling and is in keeping with the character and appearance of the local area. It, therefore, complies with Policies GEN 2 and H8 of Uttlesford Local Plan 2005, which seek to ensure good design and compatibility with surrounding buildings. The proposal also accords with National Planning Policy Framework that seeks high quality design that is sympathetic to the character of the local area.

Other Matters

9. A copy of the Great Dunmow Neighbourhood Plan 2015 – 2032 (GDNP) has been submitted as part of the appeal. However, no explanation has been provided to which elements of the GDNP are relevant and it is not referred to in the decision notice. On this basis the GDNP is a neutral factor in the determination of this appeal.

Conditions

10. The standard conditions requested by the Council are agreed with and have been duly added.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR