



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1540/D/25/3373603

73 Copse Hill, Harlow, Essex, CM19 4PW

- 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 William Gale against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref is HW/HSE/25/00243.
 - The development proposed is Double storey side extension partial to the rear of the property with a proposed front porch with atrium style fenestration and a detached garage to replace the previously existing detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council comment in their officer report that the proposal would give the impression of a new dwelling being attached to the side of the host property. However, the proposed before me is for alterations and extensions to the existing dwelling and I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a detached dwelling of a distinctive design and appearance, comprising of two original elements with a staggered footprint and a mono pitch roof design. The dwelling has been extended by way of the single storey extension on its eastern side and benefits from a garden on its western side and to the rear.
5. There are other dwellings in Copse Hill of a similar design and appearance to the appeal property which are mostly arranged in groups. The appeal property sits on its own and contrasts in design and appearance to the adjacent dwellings, with low bungalows to the east and modest two storey semi-detached houses to the west. It is prominent in the street scene as a result of its height and design in relation to adjacent dwellings and also in terms of its location at the end of the road where it dominates views when approaching from the north.
6. The proposal is for alterations to the existing dwelling, involving the relocation of the main front entrance and the removal of existing front steps and porch. A new

front entrance feature is proposed, with a large atrium window at first floor level above the new entrance. The proposed extension would extend partially to the rear of the existing dwelling and would extend to the side by about 6m in total.

7. Policy PL1 of the Harlow Local Development Plan (December 2020) (HLDP) states, amongst other things, that the design of new development should be of a high standard that is visually attractive, takes account of local character and context, and responds to the scale, height, massing and architectural detailing of the surrounding area. Further guidance is contained in the Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) and its 2021 Addendum. Amongst other things, the guidance recommends that residential extensions should be visually subservient.
8. Part of the original front wall of the dwelling would be extended forward such that it would be level with the remaining main front wall, thereby removing the original stagger. The side extension would be slightly set back from the front elevation but not significantly so. Whilst the side extension would retain a distance of about 2m to the western boundary, it would, nonetheless, appear disproportionately wide in relation to the host dwelling, extending across much of the width of the side garden and resulting in an excessively wide, bulky dwelling.
9. The excessive scale and width of the proposed extension in relation to the host dwelling, together with the lack of a meaningful set back, would result in a highly prominent, incongruous extension that would be harmful to the original character and appearance of the host dwelling and detrimental to the character and appearance of the wider area. Whilst the dwelling has already been extended on its eastern side, I do not agree that the proposed extension would result in a balanced appearance, owing to its greater height and significantly greater width.
10. I acknowledge that the rear elevation of the dwelling is not widely visible from public vantage points. However, I nonetheless find that the proposed flat roof element at first floor level would fail to appear well integrated with the host dwelling and would be at odds with the distinctive mono-pitch design and would cause further harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
11. I also acknowledge that many dwellings in Copse Hill have been subsequently altered and extended, including at Nos 44 and 77, although none of these that I could see, are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which I am required to consider on its own merits.
12. A detached double garage is also proposed to the front of the dwelling. The garage would be adjacent to the two storey extension to the side of 74 Copse Hill. Flat roof garages are a feature of the local area, however the proposed garage would be large in size, measuring 6m by 7m and a height of 2.8m. Having regard to its prominent siting forward of the dwelling and its proximity to the road, the garage would be unduly prominent in the street scene and would appear significantly at odds with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
13. There is a small tree to the front of the garage which owing to its distance from the proposed garage would be unlikely to be adversely affected by the proposal as required by Policy PL7 of the HLDC, although tree protection details would have been necessary in the event that I had found the appeal to be acceptable in other respects as it does contribute positively to the street scene.

14. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to the high-quality design objectives set out in Policy PL1 of the HLDP, the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework 2024.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR