

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/21/3285802

54 Valentine Way, Silver End, Braintree, Essex CM8 3RX

- 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 Christopher Parrish against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01290/HH, dated 30 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey rear extension and to change front and end windows to insulated types.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey rear extension and to change front and end windows to insulated types at 54 Valentine Way, Silver End, Braintree, Essex CM8 3RX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01290/HH, dated 30 July 2020, 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 Drg No 4442002, and Drg Nos 4442001B and 4442002A.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the details that are shown for the 'proposed roof plan', the two-storey rear extension hereby permitted shall be finished with a hipped roof, as shown on the 'Proposed Rear' and 'Proposed End' elevations on Drg No 4442001B.
 - 4) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The Council has no objection to the proposed replacement windows. I have no reason to disagree, noting that the local planning authority considers that the proposed replacement windows would be in keeping with the original designs for this street. The sole issue therefore is the effect of the proposed rear extension on the character and appearance of 54 Valentine Way and the Silver End Conservation Area within which the site is located.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It sits amongst rows of terraced and semi-detached dwellings that line both sides of Valentine Way which are understood to have been constructed in the first part of the 20th Century as part of an industrial model village. The street scene is distinctive by virtue of the regimented alignment of the dwellings, the consistent use of materials and detailing, and its wide, tree lined verges with houses set back from the pavements and generally fronted by low privet hedges. It is this uniformity which contributes to the Silver End Conservation Area's special character.
4. The proposal includes a part single-storey, part two-storey extension to the rear. The single-storey element would adjoin a similar single-storey extension to the rear of the attached neighbouring property at No 56. The two-storey element would be set away from the shared common boundary with No 56 and would project the style and form of the existing dwelling rearwards with the exception of a slightly chamfered corner at ground floor to provide space to allow continued access to a detached garage to the rear, which is accessed via a shared drive between Nos 54 and 52.
5. There is a slight discrepancy with the plans where the proposed side and rear elevations show that the two-storey extension would have a hipped roof whereas the proposed roof plan does not, implying a rear facing gable. Nevertheless, the officer's report confirms that the roof pitch would mimic that of the existing house, including with a hip. This is consistent with all of the proposed elevations on the drawings and I am satisfied that the configuration on the proposed roof plan is merely a drafting error.
6. Due to the gap between Nos 54 and 52, the two-storey extension would be seen projecting beyond the original rear elevation. However, it would be viewed as a fully integrated addition that would continue the form of the building in a seamless fashion. The chamfered corner at ground floor would be barely discernible from the public realm. It would not detract from the appearance of the extension which I consider would be appropriate and sympathetic, being entirely proportionate and in scale with the existing dwelling, and thereby appearing neither overly bulky nor incongruous. The appearance of No 54 when seen within the context of the street scene would be largely unaltered and unharmed.
7. Overall, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of No 54. It follows that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area, the significance of which as a heritage asset would be unaffected. As such, I find no conflict with Policies RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review (LPR), adopted July 2005,

insofar as they require development to display a high standard of layout and design that reflects local distinctiveness and harmonises with the surrounding area, or with LPR Policy RLP95 which seeks to ensure development does not detract from the character, appearance, and essential features of the conservation area. For these same reasons there would be no harm with the similar objectives of the emerging Policies LPP38, LPP50 and LPP56 of the Section 2 - Publication Draft Local Plan June 2017.

Conditions

8. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. For the same reason I have imposed a condition, which has been agreed by both parties, to require the roof over the two-storey extension to be hipped, thereby dealing with the discrepancy on the plans. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure the external materials used match those on the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, I am satisfied that there would be no harm to the character or appearance of 54 Valentine Way or to the Silver End Conservation Area. Accordingly, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR