



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2020

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/20/3248839

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 19/01790/HH, dated 30 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side / single storey front and rear extensions (revised proposals following planning refusal 19/00452/HH).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property at 44 Anson Way is a semi-detached chalet style dwelling with a cat-slide roof on the front elevation containing a large dormer window. The same style of semi-detached property is found on both sides of the road along this section of Anson Way. There is a reasonable gap between each pair of properties including between the appeal property and No 46. This provides a good amount of space and separation and is a key characteristic of this section of Anson Way.
4. The first floor of the proposed extension would be set further back from the front elevation and roof line than the previous scheme that was dismissed at appeal¹. This would make it appear more subordinate. However, the extension would still infill the entire gap between the appeal property and the boundary with No 46. The characteristic space and separation between properties would be reduced. While not physically joined, there would be a terracing effect as the two properties would move closer together. As a consequence, there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The same style of dwelling can be found across the wider residential estate. The appellant has provided numerous examples of properties that have built two storey side extensions. I saw these during my site visit. However, I do not know the planning history of these extensions, some of which look to be relatively old and potentially prior to current planning policies. Some are on

¹ APP/Z1510/D/19/3242028

corner plots or within a staggered row where terracing effects are less of an issue. Furthermore, some are on streets where a number of side extensions have been carried out close to one another. In contrast, the section of Anson Way within which the appeal property is based has no such extensions between the pairs of properties.

6. In conclusion, the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would not accord with Policies RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree Local Plan Review 2005 or Policy CS9 of the Braintree Core Strategy 2011. These policies seek the highest standards of design and layout that reflect local distinctiveness in terms of scale and massing, with extensions to houses having no material impact on the identity of the street scene, scale and character of the area.
7. The draft Braintree Local Plan has yet to pass through examination, which limits the weight that can be given to it. Nevertheless, the development would not accord with draft Policies LPP38 and LPP55 which seek a high standard of design, with extensions that are compatible with the character of the area and have no adverse material impact on the street scene. Finally, the development would not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks well-designed places.

Conclusion

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

Tom Gilbert-Wooldridge

INSPECTOR