
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2020

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/20/3257921

60 Ellen Way, Great Notley CM77 7XG

- 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 David Knight against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00756/HH, dated 26 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two 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 existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling located in a cul de sac where the other properties are bungalows. As such, whilst the appeal property is not conspicuous in the wider street scene, its height and scale give it prominence in its immediate surroundings.
 4. The proposed extension would be up to 2.4m deep, encompass the existing front projection at ground floor level and span almost the full width of the building at first floor level. Consequently, it would add very considerably to the bulk of the existing building, notwithstanding the use of a set-back and a variation in external materials in the front elevation. Given the siting of the proposed extension on the front elevation, the twin hipped roof form would do little to mitigate its bulk or make it subservient to the existing building. Indeed, the roof form would add unwelcome complexity to the front elevation and would be at odds with the simplicity of the existing gable ended main roof.
 5. The proposed fenestration would give the front elevation an appropriate ratio of solid to glazed area and the window shapes and glazing pattern would be in keeping with the existing building. However, these considerations would not overcome my concerns regarding the bulk and form of the proposed extension.
 6. Whilst the proposed extension would not breach an established building line, it would reduce the openness of the spacing between the properties in the cul de sac. This spacing is already fairly confined. The proposed extension would also
-

increase the prominence of the appeal building over the adjoining properties to the point where it would dominate its surroundings.

7. Consequently, I find that the bulk, form and siting of the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, conflict with saved Policies RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review (2005) and Policy CS9 of the Council's Adopted Core Strategy. Nor would it accord with Policies LPP38, LPP50 or LPP55 of the Council's Draft Local Plan 2017. Amongst other things, these policies require extensions to dwellings to be compatible with the original dwelling in terms of scale and bulk; to have no material impact on the identity of the street scene or the scale and character of the area. The overall elevational design should also be in harmony with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. The proposal would not accord with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework to the extent that it has similar aims.
9. The reason for refusal also cites Policies "RLP56 and RLP60 of the Draft local Plan". However, these references appear to relate to policies in the Local Plan Review dealing with vehicle parking and the Braintree Branch Line Improvement. There is nothing to suggest that these matters are relevant to the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the other concerns expressed locally, but they have not led me to a different overall conclusion.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR