



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/24/3355114

35 Pytt Field, Harlow, Essex, CM17 9AA

- 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 Sumithra Alkegamage against the decision of Harlow District Council.
 - The application Ref is HW/HSE/24/00291.
 - The development proposed is construction of a front & rear double storey extension & internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a front & rear double storey extension & internal alterations at 35 Pytt Field, Harlow, Essex, CM17 9AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HW/HSE/24/00291, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 24/03/Archi/001; 24/03/Archi/002; 24/03/Archi/003 and 24/03/Archi/004.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in the above banner heading as it concisely describes the proposal.
3. During my site visit I saw that a single storey extension had been constructed to the rear of the dwelling, together with alterations to the front entrance. I have however determined the appeal on the basis of the plans before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Pytt Field, with particular reference to light and outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal concerns a two storey, mid-terraced dwelling located in a row comprising similar properties. Prior to the construction of the recent extension, the

dwelling previously had a conservatory extension to the rear which was sited close to the boundary with 34 Pytt Field.

6. Policy PL2 of the Harlow Local Development Plan (December 2020) (HLDP) states that development which preserves or enhances the level of amenity of existing and future occupants and neighbours in the area will be supported, with reference to various criteria, including overshadowing and loss of daylight and sunlight; and aspect and outlook.
7. Further guidance is contained in the Harlow Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2011 (SPD) and its 2021 Addendum. The guidance seeks to ensure an appropriate outlook from adjoining properties is retained and recommends that for all extensions, the availability of daylight into an existing window on an adjoining property, which provides the only means of light for a habitable room, should be unaltered. It states that this should be measured from a 45-degree angle from the mid-point of the horizontal sill of the relevant window. The guidance also states that all planning applications for extensions and alterations will be considered on their individual merits. The advice within the SPD is therefore for guidance purposes and should not be rigidly applied.
8. At a depth of 4m, the proposed ground floor extension would be around a metre deeper than the previous conservatory and would extend out to the shared boundary with No 34. The first floor element of the extension would have a depth of 2m and would similarly be positioned on the boundary.
9. There is a single relatively wide window/door opening on the rear elevation of No 34 at ground floor level which appears to serve living accommodation, with a bedroom window above of the same width. There is a single storey flat roof extension to the rear of No 33 Pytt Field which also extends along its shared boundary with No 34.
10. The 4 metre deep ground floor extension would breach the 45 degree angle guideline set out in the SPD although not to a significant extent. The two storey element would have a limited depth and a flat roof design and would comfortably comply with the 45-degree angle guidance set out in the SPD.
11. Due to the limited height of the ground floor extension and the shallow depth and flat roof design of the proposed first floor element, the proposal, even in combination with the existing extension to No 33, would not impinge significantly on the amount of daylight and sunlight received by the rear windows and rear garden of No 34 and accordingly, would not be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 34. This is particularly the case as the windows to the rear of No 34 are relatively wide and have a south facing outlook, ensuring that good levels of light would continue to be received by the windows and the rear garden of the dwelling for most of the day.
12. From the downstairs window, the effect on outlook would derive mainly from the proposed adjacent single storey extension. However, the low, flat roof design of the extension would ensure that any effect on the outlook from No 34 would be limited. The taller, two storey extension would have a depth of only 2m and consequently, would not impinge significantly on the outlook from the rear of No 34.
13. I therefore find that the proposal would not have a significant overbearing impact on No 34 and would preserve acceptable levels of light and outlook. Accordingly, the

proposed development would not have a materially harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 34 Pytt Field and as such would comply with HLDP Policy PL2.

Other Matters

14. Noise and other disturbance caused during construction is inevitable but is likely to be short lived. I have no evidence before me to suggest that access to nearby dwellings would be impeded during construction. I am also satisfied that the extensions would not result in any material overlooking of adjoining occupiers, beyond that which currently exists and is to be expected in an urban area.

Conditions

15. The standard implementation condition is not necessary as the development has commenced. The approved plans condition is imposed for certainty. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to ensure that the extension in its entirety would respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR