



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/23/3328059

100 High Garrett, Bocking North, Braintree, Essex CM7 5NT

- 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 R Eley against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01596/HH was refused by notice dated 11 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is new extension comprising ground floor and upper floor with link to existing house. The extension will match the gable design of the existing house and will match as well the size and proportion. Ground floor external walls to be brickwork to suit existing house and internally blockwork with insulation in between. Upper floor to be studwork, rendered and painted to suit existing house. The roof will be roof tiles to match existing. The link will be studwork, rendered and painted to suit existing house, with natural slate roof. The room adjoining the rear of the proposed extension, to be studwork rendered and painted to suit existing house and with a natural slate lean to roof. Windows to be matched as far as possible to those of existing house and the eave details of the new roof to match those of the existing house. The timber features of the new gable to match those of the existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. I note from the history of the appeal property that it was formerly two properties. It is a non-designated heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining a planning application. A balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
 4. The appeal property is of traditional design and lies at the end of a row of residential properties in a mixed-use area that includes commercial premises. It is set back from the road in spacious grounds. Important characteristics of the property are the symmetry of the two main front gables and the
-

proportions of the frontage. As such, these features define its significance, and the property makes a positive contribution to the local street scene.

5. The proposal includes a mock replica of a main front gable linked to the host building via a single-storey side extension. From my observations, due to the design, bulk, height and position of the proposed extension, it would fail to be subordinate to the host dwelling. This would considerably increase the width of the host dwelling and with the addition of both a single-storey and two-storey element, the characteristic symmetry and proportions of the host dwelling would be significantly undermined. The extension would appear as an incongruous addition, to the detriment of the significance of this non-designated heritage asset. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
6. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. For the reasons stated above and having taken a balanced judgement, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP7, LPP36 and LPP52 in the Braintree District Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (2022), particularly where they seek a high standard of design and where they seek to ensure that extensions are subordinate to residential buildings. In addition, the proposal is contrary to policy in the Framework, particularly where the Framework seeks to achieve well designed places.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR