



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 August 2025

by **K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/25/3368809

26 Railey Road, Saffron Walden, Essex, CB11 3EN

- 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 & Mrs P Quincey against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref is UTT/25/0705/HHF.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front and a part single storey part two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front and a part single storey part two storey rear extension at 26 Railey Road, Saffron Walden, Essex, CB11 3EN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref UTT/25/0705/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: PQ 0524.01 D, PQ 0524.02 F.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as specified on the approved plans and original application form.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues. Firstly, the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, Railey Road and the surrounding area; and secondly, the effect of the proposed extensions on the living conditions of occupiers of 24 Railey Road with respect to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is one of a small cul-de-sac of similar houses extending beyond the original dwellings in Railey Road. The appeal dwelling and its similar neighbours are modest houses arranged in semi-detached pairs and short terraces that are predominantly only partly attached, resulting in a markedly stepped building line with some dwellings sitting well in front of their attached neighbours. This adds variety and interest to the street scene. The dwellings are mainly of dark brick or pale render under shallow pitched tiled roofs.

4. The appeal dwelling is semi-detached and larger than most dwellings in the cul-de-sac. It stands forward of its attached neighbour, No 24. The proposed single storey front extension would be modest in scale with a projection of some 1.5m in front of the existing dwelling and a width of about 3m. It would provide a new porch and downstairs cloakroom. It would have a pitched, lean-to roof and would be finished in a render. Whilst I did not see any similar porches in the cul-de-sac in Railey Road there are a number of similar additions on similar dwellings in adjoining and nearby streets. Moreover, the proposed render finish would contrast well with the brick of the original dwelling and would reflect the render seen on other similar dwellings in the cul-de-sac. I therefore consider that it would complement both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
5. Turning to the rear extension, owing to the stepped front and rear building lines of the semi-detached pair, the proposed extension would sit adjacent to the rear side wall of No 24. The single storey element would project to the same rear building line as No 24 and the two storey element would be shallower, with a depth of some 2m. It would occupy about half the width of the host dwelling and the pitched roof would match but be lower than the existing main roof. A pitched, lean-to roof would link the two elements. The ground floor would be finished in render with the first floor having a horizontal boarded finish. It would not be visible in the street scene of Railey Road.
6. Owing to its limited width, the set back of the first floor and the set down of the roof, the proposed extension would be subservient to the host dwelling and through sensitive design would blend sympathetically with it. The proposed render and boarding would add interest and contrast to the appeal dwelling and since both are used on similar dwellings in the local area where they harmonise successfully with the original materials, they would be compatible with the character and appearance of the area.
7. It is concluded on the first main issue that the proposed extensions would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. In consequence, they would comply with the requirements of Policies GEN2 and H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (LP), 2005, and Policies SW3(1) and SW3(4) of the Saffron Walden Neighbourhood Plan (NP), 2022, insofar as they expect new development to secure high quality design and in particular, home extensions should be of a scale, design, form, materials and layout that respects the host building and is compatible with the surrounding buildings.
8. Turning to the living conditions of occupiers at 24 Railey Road, this dwelling lies to the north of the appeal dwelling. The proposed front extension would increase the depth of the blank side wall of No 26, adjacent to the driveway at No 24. Nevertheless, this would be limited and at ground floor. Moreover, any loss of light to and outlook from the front of No 24 would be restricted by the small scale of the extension and would have only a minor effect on the driveway area and front door. Thus, it would not materially affect the lawned front garden or the main front window which is further from the appeal dwelling and which would continue to enjoy a similar level of light, and an open outlook as at present.
9. With respect to the rear extension, whilst this would lie to the south of No 24, its position, entirely within the depth of the side wall of No 24 that forms the boundary between the two dwellings, together with its limited width, lower height and the set-back of the first floor would ensure that it had no material effect on light reaching

the rear of No 24, including the garden. Moreover, it would not appear overbearing since it would not be seen from windows in No 24 and when seen from the garden it would have a lesser effect than that at a traditionally arranged pair of semi-detached houses.

10. It is concluded on the second main issue that the proposed extensions would have no materially detrimental effect on the living conditions of occupiers of 24 Railey Road with respect to outlook or light. In consequence, they would comply with LP Policies GEN2 and H8 and NP Policies SW3(1) and SW3(4) insofar as they expect new development to have no material effect on the living conditions of nearby properties with respect to light or outlook.
11. The neighbouring occupier raises concerns regarding highway safety with respect to reversing a vehicle from their driveway. However, owing to the depth of the front garden at the appeal dwelling and the limited scale of the front extension there would be no material effect on visibility to the south on exiting the driveway. Privacy in the rear garden is also raised as a concern. However, whilst the rear bedroom window would be set further back than at present, any overlooking would be limited by the remaining projection of No 24 beyond the proposed extension and the relationship would thus ensure a greater level of privacy than would occur between a traditional pair of semi-detached houses or than occurs at No 26 when seen from rear windows in No 24. The Council does not raise privacy as a material issue and I agree that the proposed relationship would be acceptable.
12. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, I agree that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty and to protect the character and appearance of the area. A condition regarding external materials is also necessary for the same reason. However, since the proposed materials would not all match those used in the existing dwelling, the wording of the condition should be revised to refer to the proposed materials. I shall adjust the wording accordingly.
13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including the objection from the Saffron Walden Town Council, which is covered in the reasoning above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR