



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by J E Jolly BA (Hons) MA MSc CIH MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/19/3242028

44 Anson Way, Braintree, CM7 9TN

- 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 & Mrs John Aldrich against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00452/HH, dated 24 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a two-storey side and a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a dense residential area of predominantly two-storey brick and tile dwellings. Anson Road is typified by pairs of semi-detached residential dwellings including No 42 and 44 Anson Way, both of which face onto the road behind a grassed front setback with concrete parking areas/separation gaps to either side. The separation gaps are a feature of the nearby built form, which in combination with the sloping topography, help to provide a sense of spaciousness in the surrounding built environment, including glimpses of the neighbouring properties, gardens, fields and hedges beyond.
4. The proposal is to add a two-storey side extension and a single-storey front extension that would be of a similar design and style to the existing building. The proposal would extend across and along most of the existing parking area and trace the boundary with No 46 Anson Way.
5. The relatively modest scale of the proposal is possible on the appeal site without detriment to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers as evidenced by the submitted drawings. However, the close proximity of the proposal to No 46 would significantly narrow the gap between the two dwellings. As such the separation gap, that currently offers glimpses of the area beyond, and avoids a continuous built up frontage would be reduced.

6. Accordingly, the erosion of the gap would be at odds with the prevailing street-scene and would result in a visually cramped development. Moreover, the reduction of the gap between the dwellings would create a 'terrace-like' appearance that would be incongruous with the surrounding built environment and cause harm to the wider character and appearance of the area.
7. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policies RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Council Adopted Plan 2005, Policy CS9 of the Braintree Local Development Framework Core Strategy, and Policies LPP38 and LPP55 of the Braintree District Council draft Local Plan, which say, amongst other things, that all development should respect and respond to local context and that there should be no material impact on the identity of the street scene, scale and character of the area.
8. For similar reasons, the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which aims include that development is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the Appellant's comments regarding similar extensions in the nearby area. However, at my site visit I noted that the majority of these extensions form part of a corner dwelling where the plot is sufficient to accommodate development without detriment to the character and appearance of the area. I also note the submitted examples of 'infill' extensions, for example those in Hawkins Way. However, whether this is an acceptable form of development or not, I cannot be certain if it was permitted under the current development plan. Therefore, I have considered the proposal in this case on the basis of its own planning merits.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J E JOLLY

INSPECTOR