



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 April 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/25/3362130

5 Wyldwood Close, Harlow, Essex CM17 0JD

- 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 Ms Frankie Campbell against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application ref is HW/HSE/24/00416.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, outbuilding to rear of garden and front porch extension to front of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, outbuilding to rear of garden and front porch extension to front of property at 5 Wyldwood Close, Harlow, Essex CM17 0JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: HW/HSE/24/00416, 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: 082/24/1001 Revision A (Front Porch and Single storey rear extension) and 082/24/1002 Revision A (Outbuilding).

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. It is clear from the Council's decision notice and officer report that it found the proposed porch to be acceptable and that its concerns relate to the proposed single storey rear extension and outbuilding. I have defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed single storey rear extension and the proposed outbuilding on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is located at the end of Wyldwood Close, a cul-de-sac, which is characterised by large residential properties, set behind front gardens. The properties on the street vary in design but are predominantly traditional in style. They are mainly served by large rear gardens. 5 Wyldwood Close is a two-storey

dwelling with single storey side projections and roof spaces served by dormers. The rear of the property is largely concealed from the street by a brick wall and gate. There is boundary fencing to the perimeter of the rear garden together with planting both within the site and on neighbouring land and gardens. Consequently, the dwelling and its gardens positively contribute to a spacious residential environment.

6. The appeal dwelling sits side on to its substantial rear lawn and the rear elevation backs on to a hard paved area with a boundary fence and mature planting beyond. Consequently, the rear elevation is not highly discernible from outside the site. The extension's location to this side of the dwelling, together with its single storey height, means that it would not be highly perceptible from the public realm. In any case, the outer sections of its roof would reflect the hips on the rear elevation of the dwelling and matching materials would also be utilised. As a result, the scale and design of the extension would suitably respond to the host dwelling particularly given the degree to which it would be appreciated.
7. I accept that the rear extension's substantial footprint would be larger than the general depth of rear extensions normally envisaged in The Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2011) and Addendum (2021) (SPD). Even so, the SPD confirms that this guidance is subject to other considerations, including but not limited to the loss of garden space. Given the considerable garden space which would remain, and the single storey scale and discreet location of the extension, this is an instance where other considerations do not indicate that the extension would result in any material harm to the appearance of the host dwelling or the spacious characteristics of the area.
8. Whilst the proposed outbuilding would also have a substantial footprint exceeding the general guidance in the SPD, it would be located at the far end of the host dwelling's generously proportioned garden. Its single storey, flat roofed design would give it a low profile which in combination with the sloping topography would help to ensure it appears subservient to the host dwelling. Together with the boundary fencing and mature planting within the site, the outbuilding would cause little visual intrusion to neighbours in line with the SPD. For these reasons, the outbuilding would effectively assimilate into its surroundings.
9. I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension and the proposed outbuilding would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard the proposed development would comply with the requirements of Policy PL1 of the Harlow Local Development Plan (2020) for all development to be of a high standard of design and to protect local distinctiveness without restricting style and innovation, whilst taking account of local character and context.

Conditions

10. Conditions with the usual timescale for implementation, and confirming the approved plans, are attached in the interests of certainty and precision. The approved plans identify that the materials for the extension are to match the existing dwelling. I also find that the materials specified for the outbuilding, would provide for a suitable garden building aesthetic and would assist its integration into its surroundings. Therefore, a separate materials condition is neither reasonable nor necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR