



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/24/3347127

1 Joseph Clibbon Drive, Springfield, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 6AS.

- 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 Matt Sotayo against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00352/FUL.
 - The development proposed is soft landscaping, proposed parking space with hard standing.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Joseph Clibbon Drive is a residential road located in Beaulieu, a recent major development to the north of Chelmsford. This extensive planned estate has a degree of uniformity with the dwellings set back from the frontage, planted front gardens and paved driveways for off-street parking. In addition to the contemporary design of the properties the development is characterised by significant areas of soft landscaping. Number 1 Joseph Clibbon Drive (No1) is a three-storey house.
4. The house has previously been enlarged by the construction of a two-storey rear/side extension along with a detached garage/outbuilding. Condition 5 of planning approval 21/01378/FUL for the garage/outbuilding required a parking area to be provided to the front of the garage measuring at least 6m in depth and 5 m in width. It was to be provided free of obstruction and kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles and for no other purpose. The Council considered that this area together with one space in the garage would provide 3 parking spaces in accordance with the Beaulieu parking standards required to serve this property as extended. Further, the cars on the forecourt would be parked at 90 degrees to the road as the neighbouring properties.
5. However, the area of land between the garage and the side of the new extension is, as I saw, now partially enclosed by a fence such that there is only sufficient space for one car to park in front of the garage. Accordingly, there is

- one off-road parking space in the garage with a second space in front of the garage. A further space, parallel to the two-storey extension, and between it and the road is, as I saw also currently in use for parking a third vehicle.
6. The appellant seeks permission for the retention and formalisation of the parallel parking space in front of the earlier extension along with the retention of railings on the side of the dwelling and soft landscaping to the side of the dwelling.
 7. No1 is located on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Joseph Clibbon Drive and Armistice Avenue. The introduction of parallel parking side on to Joseph Clibbon Drive would significantly increase the width of the frontage area of hardstanding and reduce the area available for planting to the side of the dwelling. This would result in a small but notable departure from the carefully considered design and layout of residential parking within the street.
 8. The side garden of No1 facing Joseph Clibbon Drive, albeit relatively small, makes an important visual contribution to this frontage of the built form, and if soft landscaped would reinforce the verdant nature of the development as a whole.
 9. Given the well designed and planned layout of the development introduction of parallel parking and the extension of the hardstanding and the loss of soft landscaping, that might otherwise be achieved, in front of the side addition facing the road would serve to significantly denude the visual amenity of area. in addition, as I observed on my visit, due to the limited width of the space a parked car here, between the railings and the face of the previous extension appears awkward and cramped.
 10. Furthermore, the change in layout, although modest may well in turn set a precedent for other small harmful incremental changes that would cumulatively denude the attractive design and layout of the estate as a whole.
 11. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would result in poorly designed parking layout that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the both the street scene and the wider area. To allow it would be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM23 of the Chelmsford Local Plan (Adopted 27 May 2020) as they relate to, amongst other things, high quality design and the need to respect the character and appearance of the area in which it is located.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR