



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2021

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/21/3273456

64 Feering Hill, Feering, CO5 9NL

- 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 and Mrs P Evans against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02118/HH, dated 11 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above the existing garage – to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this case are its effect on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of residents.

Reasons

3. 64 Feering Hill is a two storey detached house with a garage set to the front and connected to the main house by a single storey link. It is in an established residential area with many various sizes, styles and design of dwellings along the street. There is no real uniform building line, although the majority of dwellings along most of the immediate part of the street are set some distance back from the highway, typically behind a grass verge. Several properties have single storey garages or outbuildings set forward of the main house.
4. The street has a spacious character because of its width, but there are some sections where mature landscaping and tall trees introduce some sense of enclosure and soften the built form by providing screening.
5. I consider that the relevant policies in this case include RLP17 and RLP90 of the Adopted Local Plan 2005 (the local plan), which relate to residential extensions and the layout and design of development. They require, among other things, proposals to be compatible with the original dwelling, with no material impact on the identity of the street scene and the scale and character of the area. Policy CS9 of the Braintree District Core Strategy adopted 2011 (the Core Strategy) promotes high standards of design and layout in new development.
6. The Council also refers to policies LPP38, LPP50 and LPP55 of the emerging Section 2 of the Draft Local Plan (Section 2). These carry forward similar

criteria to those set out in policies RLP17 and RLP90. They are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (the Framework) and therefore carry some weight in this appeal.

7. I consider that the proposed first floor extension over the garage would appear too bulky and dominant a feature both in itself and in relation to the overall form of the rest of the house. The garage is already a prominent feature at the front of the house and this would further unbalance the architectural character of the building.
8. The proposed hipped roof would be set down from the main ridge height. While this would reduce its impact on the overall appearance of the building it would still result in an element which would be out of scale with the existing house. The use of a render finish on the front and west elevation would lighten its appearance, though I am not persuaded that imitating the mock Tudor detailing would amount to an improvement.
9. No. 64, although set back some distance from the highway, is still one of the most forward sited dwellings along the road. It is not readily visible in long views from the east as it is partially screened by other houses. It is only partially screened from the west by mature trees, some of which are deciduous and provide limited cover when the leaves are off. It is clearly visible in closer views, where it would appear out of proportion and poorly related to the rest of the house. I note the appellants' reluctance to extend to the rear of the house. However, I do not consider that the proposal is an acceptable solution to their requirements.
10. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the house itself and the wider street scene, contrary to local plan policies RLP17 and RLP90, Core Strategy policy CS9 and the Framework.
11. I consider that the siting, scale and height of the proposal, particularly the east side elevation, which would be approximately 7m long with the same eaves height as that of the main house, would appear somewhat overbearing in the outlook from a front and a side window of the bungalow at No. 70. However, this property is set well back from the road and most of it is behind the rear elevation of No. 64. Most of the front garden is laid to gravel for parking. The front windows and the front parking area are mostly overshadowed already by the main house at No.64 and I consider that the proposal would have a limited impact on the property in terms of light.
12. I find that the long blank side wall would have some adverse impact on the outlook from No. 70, and in this respect, I conclude that the proposal would not be wholly consistent with local plan policies RLP17 and RLP90 and Core Strategy policy CS9 as they relate to the protection of the amenities of neighbouring residents. I consider that it would not be sufficient, on its own, to warrant dismissing the appeal. However, it adds some weight to my finding on the other main issue.
13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR