

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/16/3162730

164 Beehive Lane, Great Baddow, Chelmsford, Essex, CM2 9SH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jamie Green against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00999/FUL, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Proposed new garage to front with new crossover.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council has not raised objections to the proposal's effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Similarly, the Highway Authority, subject to conditions regarding the provision of a shared vehicular access with the neighbouring property, No 162, does not consider that the proposal would impact adversely on highway safety. I agree with this approach and, consequently, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Local character surrounding the appeal site is typified by good sized dwellinghouses set back from the street with front curtilages allowing, in many cases, parking within. No 164 Beehive Lane, the appeal property is a case in point and I noted at my site visit that the dwelling also has an integral double garage.
 4. The proposal seeks planning permission for a front extension, of partial width to the dwelling's frontage, attached to the existing garage area. Some 8m in depth, the new building would extend almost to the back edge of the footway. Although the appellant refers to similar developments existing in the locality, from my site visit this does not appear to be the case along Beehive Lane. I did observe other front garage extensions on the opposite side of the street but these relate to dwellings set further back from the street. Indeed, the appeal property's relatively shallow driveway depth is an important factor.
-

5. Whilst Nos 235 and 241, as examples, exhibit significant front extensions their deeper driveways allow for a more satisfactory built arrangement in relation to the host dwelling and also the visual effect on the streetscene. In contrast, I consider that the proposed development would be particularly prominent in its setting whilst its form and design would sit awkwardly with the main dwelling. The extension's shallow roof planes would not reflect the host dwelling's characteristic features and this would be compounded by its depth relative to that of the surrounding front curtilage.
6. In light of the above I consider that the form of development proposed and the resultant physical arrangement would be in direct conflict with the Council's Local Plan (LP) Policies DC45 and DC47(A) which, amongst other things, require that new development has regard to local character to ensure that the streetscene is not adversely affected. Further, it is stipulated that there should be an appropriate visual relationship between developments on individual sites. As the extension would appear more as an add-on appendage there would be little subordination to the dwelling itself – an important consideration when assessing the planning merits, or otherwise, of domestic extensions – and in this instance such a visual relationship would not occur.
7. I have had regard to the appellant's points that the proposal is seen as necessary due to security issues and that it would allow for improved on-site parking and manoeuvrability within but these factors, even if similar extensions do exist locally, are insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have indicated would result from the development proposed. Also, I am not convinced that all options have been explored in an attempt to meet the appellant's requirements and, in this respect he does refer to discussions held with the Council subsequent to the application being refused. However, I have not seen any revised drawings/plans in this respect and am therefore unable to comment. Indeed, negotiations as to any future resubmission must remain a matter between the two main parties.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and this would be contrary to the aims of LP Policies DC45 and DC47(A), whose objectives are reflected in relevant advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR