



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/25/3366283

35 Glebelands, Harlow, Essex CM20 2PA

- 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 Robert Webb against the decision of Harlow Council.
 - The application Ref is HW/HSE/24/00470.
 - The development proposed is construction of a two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a two-storey rear extension and single storey extension at 35 Glebelands, Harlow, Essex CM20 2PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HW/HSE/24/00470, 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 drawing nos. 2663.01 existing, location and block plans, 2663.02 existing elevations, 2663.03 proposed plans and 2663.04 proposed elevations.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.
 - 4) Prior to the occupation of the accommodation hereby approved, arrangements for both waste bin and cycle storage shall have been provided in accordance with details that shall have had the prior written approval of the Council.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application describes the proposal as construction of a two-storey rear extension. However, this includes a single storey element which I have considered as part of the overall scheme. Therefore, I have amended the description accordingly in the decision.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposal on
 - the character and appearance of the Mark Hall North Conservation Area (CA),

- the living conditions of occupiers at 34 Glebelands, with particular regard to sunlight, daylight and outlook, and
- the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to traffic, parking and waste disposal.

Reasons

Character and appearance of CA

4. The significance of the CA relates primarily to its townscape and historic value as the first Harlow New Town neighbourhood built to the Frederick Gibberd master plan. It had been designed to provide an open layout of development set within generous areas of intervening green spaces. As evident in Glebelands, the architecture is of a modern character, comprising simple, homogenous forms, such as the two-storey, exposed brick, mono-pitched roofed terrace of houses, to which No 35 comprises one end.
5. The two storey element would be at the end of the terrace, with the outward facing gable widened by roughly a third, of matching brickwork with two additional windows and a roof sloping gently to the rear. Solar panels are proposed over the existing and proposed roof slopes which, due to their shallow pitches, would not be visually prominent.
6. The extension would necessitate the removal of boundary vegetation, which as overgrown hedging could legitimately be cut down or removed. Like a very similar extension allowed in the quite recent past at nearby 105 Glebelands¹, this proposal would be in a publicly prominent position. However, like that at No 105, it would not overwhelm the existing dwelling and, through a complementary simple design with matching brickwork, be of a satisfactory appearance within the context of the existing townscape. Therefore, this scheme would not detract from the significance of the CA as identified, having a neutral effect upon this designated heritage asset and preserving its character and appearance. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy PL12 of the Harlow Local Development Plan² (HLDP), as this applies Chapter 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework concerning the historic environment.
7. This proposal would cause no material harm in respect to any loss of green infrastructure and landscaping and so would not be in conflict with HLDP Policy PL8. Because the extension would remain subordinate to the main house and respond adequately to this in terms of scale, design and materials, this proposal would comply with HLDP Policy PL1 and the design principles this applies.

Living conditions at No 34

8. The single storey element of the extensions would abut the boundary to the next door house at No 34. It would involve removal of the existing boundary vegetation and rise a metre above any permitted two metre boundary fence. It would clearly impinge on the outlook and sunlight/daylight received from the rear windows and adjacent back garden at No 34. However, the same would apply to a single storey rear extension that might be built as permitted development, which is a fallback situation I give significant weight to. The separating wall would provide a degree of

¹ Council ref HW/PL/03/00462

² Harlow Local Development Plan – adopted December 2020

seclusion to the back garden area next door, with its south facing outlook still offering good levels of sunlight to this and rear facing windows. Overall, the single storey element would alter the living conditions at No 34, but not to such a degree as to have an unacceptably adverse impact.

9. From downstairs windows the impact on outlook would derive mainly from the adjacent single storey extension proposed. The taller, two storey element would be set back from the boundary to No 34 and not impinge upon a 45 degree sight line from its first floor rear windows. Therefore, the two-storey element would not have an unduly overbearing impact on the outlook from upstairs rear windows at No 34, as to have an unacceptable effect on living conditions.
10. The proposal would alter the living conditions experienced by occupiers at No 34. However, the proposal would not have an overbearing impact and would preserve acceptable levels of amenity for these neighbours, in respect of outlook and access to daylight and sunlight, as to comply with HLDP policies PL1 and PL2.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

11. The appeal property currently comprises a four bedroom house in multiple occupation (HMO), already licensed for up to six people. This use had commenced prior to the Council making an Article 4 Direction that removed the permitted development right to change a property from a C3 use as a dwellinghouse to a C4 use as a small HMO, occupied by no more than six residents.
12. The Council has noted that the proposed increased number and size of bedrooms would provide capacity for eight residents, based on room sizes set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards, and that the submitted floor plans show bedspaces for seven people. Whilst such an occupancy level would constitute a sui generis use as a larger HMO, requiring planning permission, this is not the proposal before me. The appellant is not presently seeking to raise occupancy above the licensed six persons, for which this number of bedrooms is proposed.
13. Therefore, this proposal is not subject to the criteria of HLDP Policy H3, including the need to provide off-street parking. Moreover, this is not a location where occupiers would be highly reliant on having access to a private vehicle. There is no evidence pointing to a high level of parking stress in this location. In relation to the scale of this proposal, I am satisfied there is sufficient on-street parking capacity in this area to accommodate any greater demand. Therefore, it would not lead to a significant increase in on-street congestion as to give rise to safety and amenity harm to neighbouring residents through undue parking stress. Given cycle parking and waste storage can be addressed by a condition, the proposal would comply with HLDP Policy IN2, in respect of access and servicing, and Policy IN3, over parking requirements.
14. The proposal would not lead to such intensification of the present use such that the associated traffic, parking and refuse management impacts would be harmful to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and other local residents and there would be no material conflict with HLDP policies PL2 and PL1 in this regard.

Other Matters

15. Neighbouring residents have raised further concerns which, whilst entirely understandable, relate to issues somewhat beyond the remit of land use planning

control. No 35 is already an HMO, licensed to accommodate up to six residents, and this proposal would not change this. Therefore, concerns over anti-social behaviour, noise and disturbance fall somewhat outside the scope of the planning considerations pertinent to this decision. Similar considerations apply to property maintenance and management issues, such as waste bin storage. However, applying a planning condition governing waste bin as well as cycle storage, as suggested by the appellant, would appear both reasonable and necessary to address the concerns raised.

Balance and Conclusion

16. The proposal would provide a better standard of accommodation, addressing a recognised housing need. Such benefits would outweigh any planning harm found and so the proposal would comply with the HLDP as a whole. In addition to the standard three year time period for commencement, a further condition is necessary in the interests of certainty which establishes the plans permitted. These specify that the facing brickwork for the extension will match the existing house. However, a condition is still necessary requiring agreement to the external materials used in the extension, to ensure these provide a satisfactory match. As discussed, a condition is required to secure agreed arrangements for waste bin and cycle storage. Subject to these conditions, I conclude the appeal succeeds.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR