



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2024

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/24/3337935

80 London Road, Braintree, Essex CM7 2AS

- 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 A Smith against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/02622/HH, dated 25 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a one and a half storey side 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 host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is served by a long private access from London Road. It comprises a detached one and a half storey dwelling, with dormers set low into its sloping roof to the front and rear. It stands alone, on a large plot, amongst fairly open ground, and at a lower elevation than a recent housing development known as Meadow Rise, which lies to the south. It does not therefore form part of a recognisable 'streetscene'.
4. The property has planning permission for a detached garage close to its southern boundary (Ref: 23/01637/HH), and planning permission for a one and a half storey side extension (Ref: 23/00536/HH) ('permitted extension'). At the time of my visit, work was well underway on the permitted extension, which takes the form of a cross wing on the host's northern flank, furthest from Meadow Rise.
5. The proposal comprises an additional wing to the south, to mirror that being built to the north. Whilst it would thereby restore some symmetry to the property, the resultant building would have a very long elongated form and a very expansive roof, with the Council calculating that the original dwelling's width would increase from around 16 metres to 27 metres.
6. Having regard to cumulative impacts, although the permitted extension and the proposal before me would be no taller than the original building, taken together they would more than double its floorspace. Consequently, and given their

front and rear projecting gables, they would markedly increase its scale, complexity and bulk.

7. As pointed out by the appellant, the dwelling now on the site is no longer the same as it was in 2022 when a planning application for cross wings to the north and south was refused. However, the proposed extension before me, when considered along with the permitted extension, would not appear subordinate to the original dwelling, whose much more modest scale and simply proportioned form and character would be largely subsumed.
8. From London Road, the resultant building would only be seen in distant views, which would be partially screened by landscaping. However, the harmful impact I have identified would be clearly apparent from the much closer and higher ground of Townrow Avenue on the Meadow Rise estate, including from the front faces of the dwellings, and in public views from the estate's nearby footpaths, green spaces, and a children's play area.
9. In those views, the resultant dwelling, with its deep southern flank and similar flank to the north, would appear as an overly dominant building. It would draw-the-eye as a prominent and incongruously bulky feature, in an otherwise largely open setting with a backdrop of trees and landscaping.
10. Whilst views of the site from those locations will change when the permitted detached garage is built, and could change further as a result of other development that could theoretically be carried out without the need for planning permission, that harmful impact would nonetheless persist.
11. The scheme would thereby harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would thus conflict with the general stance in Policies LPP1, LPP47 and LPP52 of the Braintree District Local Plan 2013 - 2033. Amongst other things, and in broad terms, these promote a high standard of design which would not cause material adverse detriment to the character of an area, having regard to matters such as scale.
12. It would also conflict with the more specific stance in its Policy LPP36 that, having regard to cumulative impacts, extensions shall be subordinate to the original dwelling in terms of matters such as bulk; and it would fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement for good design.
13. Consequently, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR