



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/24/3340865

9 Western Road, Silver End, Essex CM8 3SD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Gray against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02903/HH.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer extension to front at 9 Western Road, Silver End, Essex CM8 3SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/02903/HH, subject to 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: Plan 1 of 2, Nov 2023; Plan 2 of 2, Nov 2023.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site includes a semi-detached chalet bungalow that faces towards a highway junction between Western Road and Grooms Lane. The dwelling features a shared small front dormer with 11 Western Road which is set within a large roof slope. Nos 9 and 11 also each have an attached garage that links to other semi-detached chalet bungalows of the same original design. The dwellings all sit in a row and have similarly sized front gardens such that they form a housing group with a consistent character and appearance. However, alterations to the dwellings, such as garage conversions and porch and flue pipe additions, are evident in public views. Notably, 17 Western Road features a dormer extension beside its original front dormer. Otherwise, the area is characterised predominantly by housing of varying ages and designs, some of which also includes front dormers.
4. The proposed front dormer extension would be proportionate to the size of the existing roof slope at No 9 and similar in size, siting and form to the one at No 17. The Council highlights that there is no record of planning permission having been granted for the development at No 17. However, there is no indication that it is or should be subject to enforcement action and, based on my

observations on site, it has been in situ for a considerable time. As such, it is an established feature within the housing group. Although the proposed extension would be more prominent than the one at No 17 due to its position by the junction and there would be a loss of symmetry to the roof slopes of Nos 9 and 11, it would nevertheless echo the current form of No 17 and, in that context, be a congruent addition to the row of dwellings. The uniform building line would not be affected. Furthermore, the scheme would be respectful of the varied housing within the wider area.

5. Accordingly, the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. The scheme therefore accords with policies LPP36, LPP47 and LPP52 of the Braintree District Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. Amongst other things, these provide criteria for proposals for residential alterations and extensions, promote a high standard of design and layout, and seek that local context is respected.
6. The standard time condition is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition to require the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans is also needed for that reason, but also to ensure that the scheme will be finished in the materials specified on those plans, which would reflect the existing bungalow. This will ensure that the impacts on the character and appearance of the area are appropriate.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR