
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1570/D/25/3370944

Edwina, Wicken Road, Clavering, Essex, CB11 4QT

- 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 Mrs Najat Johnson against the decision of Uttlesford District Council.
 - The application Ref is UTT/25/1324/HHF.
 - The development proposed is the removal of single storey rear extension and side metal flue, erection of part two storey, part single storey rear extension, removal of centre chimney stack, insertion of a new side chimney stack, alterations to fenestration, relocation of front entrance door and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed rear extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene of Wicken Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a traditional, semi-detached house on a very long plot. It lies behind a small frontage in a row of dwellings of mixed age, design and size on Wicken Road. The building line in the street is variable, with the dwellings to the west of Edwina, the appeal dwelling, being noticeably set back from the street. This exposes to view the side elevation of the appeal dwelling and space to the rear.
4. The appeal dwelling has previously been extended to the side at two storeys to approximately double the size of the original modest house. The extension is seamless with the original façade and whilst large, preserves the original attractive, traditional character and appearance of the dwelling at both the front and back. The attached neighbour also has a side extension, this is more modest, with a set down roof and semi-dormer to the front.
5. The Council does not raise an objection to the removal of the existing single storey rear extension and side metal flue, the removal of the centre chimney stack, the insertion of a new side chimney stack or the relocation of front entrance door and I agree these would be acceptable. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the proposed extension.

6. The proposed extension would be to the rear of the dwelling but would project beyond the existing side elevation, meaning both the front and side elevations would be clearly visible from the street. Together with the existing extension, it would increase the size of the original small house by a substantial margin. From in front of the dwelling the significant setback and modest side projection would mean the proposed extension did not appear as a disproportionate or overly dominant feature.
7. Nevertheless, the side elevation, which would be clearly visible from Wicken Road across the frontage of the neighbouring dwelling, would be a stark and dominant feature. The extension would be deeper than the existing dwelling and although the single storey element would be less imposing this is modest in scale compared with the majority of the extension which would be at two storeys. Despite the ridge of the proposed roof being set down slightly from the height of the existing main ridge, the extension would stand out as a large and inharmonious addition to the dwelling.
8. Although not visible from the street, the rear elevation would have a significant effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The excessive width of the extension would be exacerbated by the horizontal design emphasis which would be at odds with the dwelling as a whole. A wide rear facing gable would be introduced that would be an incongruous element in the context of the original building. This would be aggravated by the introduction of windows noticeably wider than they are high, whereas the majority of the existing windows, especially at first floor, are sash windows with a clear vertical emphasis, in keeping with the age and style of the original house.
9. In addition, the two storey rear extension would subsume the characteristic two storey rear outrigger and the awkward juxtaposition between the original roof and the proposed new gable ended roof would draw attention to this and the consequent loss of character.
10. Overall, the proposed extension would be an overly large and bulky addition to the original dwelling. Its design, which would be at odds with that of the existing dwelling, would add to its incongruous and detrimental effect, detracting from the original character and appearance of the dwelling. Its clear visibility from the street would introduce an unsympathetic addition to the street scene, exacerbating the harm.
11. The appellant suggests that since the dwelling is on a large plot this should be taken into account as it has been in the case of other large extensions to dwellings locally. However, the size of the plot is not at issue. As reasoned above, it is the scale, siting and design of the proposed extension that is unacceptable. Moreover, since the dwelling is close to and visible from the highway the large plot to the rear would not mitigate against the harm to the street scene.
12. The appellant also points out that Policy H8 of the Uttlesford Local Plan (LP), 2005, requires extensions to dwellings to respect (rather than be subservient to) the host dwelling in terms of scale, design and external materials. However, I have assessed the proposed extension on its own merits and in the context of this policy and found that, owing to its scale and design it would fail to respect the original building for the reasons set out above.

13. It is further suggested that since the extension would be to the rear its effect would be less. However, whilst the LP sets out that rear extensions can have less impact on the street scene, in this case, owing to the clear visibility of the side elevation in the street scene, it would still have a materially detrimental effect, notwithstanding that it would not be visible in long views or from the east. Moreover, the fact that there is no consistency of design in the immediate area would not justify allowing an extension that did not respect the host dwelling.
14. Finally, my attention is drawn to a number of examples of large extensions that have been permitted elsewhere, some on very large plots where this has been a relevant factor. However, I have limited details regarding these other cases and in any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits as I am required to do.
15. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed rear extension, owing to its scale, design and siting would have a materially detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the street scene of Wicken Road and the surrounding area. In consequence it would conflict with LP Policies GEN2 and H8 which expect extensions to be compatible with and respect the scale, form, layout, appearance and materials of surrounding buildings, including the host dwelling.
16. The appellant argues that the extension would bring the dwelling up to modern living standards. That may be so. However, this would not justify an extension that was materially harmful to character and appearance.
17. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR