



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 9th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/17/3176464

53 Station Road, Sible Hedingham CO9 3QA

- 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 Ms Samantha Cocks against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00150/FUL, dated 28 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is erection of cart lodge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a cart lodge at 53 Station Road, Sible Hedingham CO9 3QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00150/FUL, dated 28 January 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Block Plan (P17-01 SHT 1 of 2), Proposed Elevations (P17-1 SHT 1 of 2), Street Scene Elevations (P17-01 SHT 1 of 1), all dated January 2017, and Location Plan.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials specified in the application form.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The semi-detached properties at 35-53 Station Road are set back considerably from the road at a higher level than the pavement. Each property has a long front garden that serves as the principal outdoor space. There is much variety in terms of the appearance and landscaping of each front garden, from enclosed gardens with mature planting to those dominated by car parking. There is a range of outbuildings of different sizes from small garden sheds to larger structures for cars. The appellant highlights recently granted planning permission for a single garage at the front of No 37 which is not yet built.

4. The appeal site at No 53 is situated on the corner with Christmas Field. As a consequence, it is a wider plot with a wider front garden that is undergoing new landscaping. Given its corner location and elevated position, the garden is prominent in views especially to the north and north-east.
5. The proposed cart lodge would be a large structure along the side boundary, but would be subservient in size to the main house and less than half the width of the plot. The development would be prominent in views due to the location and elevated ground levels. However, given its proportions and siting in relation to the house and plot, and the variety of structures and landscaping within front gardens of properties at Nos 35-53, it would not be unduly conspicuous.
6. The proposed materials would be simple and sympathetic to the street scene, while proposed railings and planting would help to reduce the effect of the development. As the plot width at No 53 is larger than its neighbours, it is able to accommodate a structure of this size. Thus, the development is unlikely to set a precedent for similar sized structures on the narrower plots at Nos 35-51.
7. In conclusion, the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would accord with Policies RLP3, RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review 2005. Amongst other things, these policies seek to protect the character of the existing street scene, with the siting, bulk, form, materials and height of development compatible with the original dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conditions

8. Conditions setting a time limit for the commencement of development and for it to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for clarity and compliance. A condition requiring the external materials to match what is specified in the application form is necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR