



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/22/3307879

1 Pollards Green Springfield Chelmsford Essex CM2 6UH

- 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 Bambur against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01059/FUL, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, single storey front extension. Alteration to position of entrance door and design of front elevation. Alteration of front elevation materials.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension, alteration to position of entrance door and design of the front elevation and alteration of front elevation materials.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension. Planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 1 Pollards Green Springfield Chelmsford Essex CM2 6UH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01059/FUL dated 26 May 2022, so far as is relevant to the development hereby permitted and the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan and Block Plan Drawing No. 796/04, Proposed Ground Floor Plan Drawing No 796.05 Rev E, Proposed First Floor and Roof Plan Drawing No 796/06 Rev E and Proposed Elevations and Sections Drawing No 796/07 Rev E.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the applicant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have used the Council's description as this provides a more accurate description of the development.
4. The proposed development consists of a number of elements. The Council has indicated that it has no objections to the single storey rear extension and the

addition of render to the front elevation. I shall accordingly direct my assessment to the single storey front extension, the alteration to the position of entrance door and design of front elevation.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. No 1 Pollards Green, the appeal property, (No 1) is a large detached dwelling sited near to the junction of Pollards Green and Chelmer Village Way. Pollards Green is the primary access road to a substantial modern residential estate. There is a mixture of dwelling styles within the estate but there remains a cohesive pattern of development primarily through the use of distinctive features and common materials. One such feature throughout the estate, and shared by No 1, is a projecting jettied first floor gable.
7. No 1 is sited at an oblique angle to and set back from the highway. This positioning and the site's external boundary treatment does provide an element of screening. However, the upper part of the proposed extension and in particular the height of the pitched roof would cover a sizable area of the existing gable and introduce a second wider gable element to the front elevation. As such, the resultant extension would be overly dominant and would be visible. The height and width of the proposed extension together with the design of the roof, and stark contrast in materials, would result in an unduly prominent front elevation in those views which are obtained from Pollards Green. As such, it would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. The appellant refers to the number of front projecting elevations throughout the estate as a common feature. However these features are an integral part of the original design of a particular house type and do not detract from the overall appearance of the dwellings. Nor did I see any similar examples within the locality where there has been an alteration to the front elevation as currently proposed. In any event, it is the design and materials of the proposed extension which would cause the harmful effect in this case.
9. I acknowledge that this is a contemporary design with the use of modern innovative materials. I note also that the introduction of hardi plank claddings on some dwellings within the estate provides a modern contrast with some of the mock Tudor facades found therein. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also promotes innovative design, but it also indicates that it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. I note also that the Essex Design Guide does not preclude the use of different materials when considering architectural details within new developments in Essex. However, the Chelmsford City Council Making Places Supplementary Planning Document (Making Places) specifically provides in relation to extensions that materials should relate well to the host dwelling as well as the surrounding area. In this case, the use of such materials taken with the design of the proposal would be a distinctive feature at odds with the prevailing character of the streetscene along Pollards Green where there are no examples of such materials nor design.

10. The appellant has also drawn my attention to other examples within the Borough where the use of such materials has been accepted. However the individual example's design drawn to my attention is such that the extension is not seen as an integral part of the host dwelling but separate from it. Of the other examples given, the two developments cited are new urban residential developments where the use of these materials appears a common feature within the design of contemporary new homes. As such direct parallels with the proposal before me are not easily drawn. In any event, each case must be determined on its own merits and the individual circumstances involved.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it would be contrary to Policy DM23 of the Chelmsford Local Plan (Local Plan) which requires development to be compatible to the character and appearance of the area and where relevant, to the host building in terms of amongst other things, scale, form, materials and detailing. It would also be contrary to the Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matter

12. As the single storey rear extension is both physically and functionally severable from the other elements of the proposal, I find that a split decision would be appropriate in this instance. Accordingly the appeal should succeed in relation only to the single storey rear extension.

Conditions

13. In respect of that part of the development hereby approved, I have attached the standard time condition and a plans condition to ensure certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given and having taken all matters into account, the appeal is dismissed in relation to the single storey front extension, the alteration to position of entrance door and the design of the front elevation and alteration of front elevation materials. The element of the proposal which relates to the single storey rear extension is allowed in accordance with my formal decision given above.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR