



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/24/3354702

2 Ludham Hall Lane, Black Notley, Essex CM77 8QT

- 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 Lawford against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01356/HH.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of two storey front extension at 2 Ludham Hall Lane, Black Notley, Essex CM77 8QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01356/HH and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials of the front extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P23-03; P23-04.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and local area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling on Ludham Hall Lane, a small, quiet no-through lane located off London Road in a semi-rural setting, connecting to a public footpath. Ludham Hall Lane has a mixture of detached and semi-detached dwellings of varying designs and sizes, all of which are set back from the road.
5. The appeal dwelling is situated on a section of Ludham Hall Lane which consists of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings which are similar in form but no longer uniform in design or scale. They feature various extensions and alterations

including porches, side extensions and roof alterations in different combinations and with different roof types. There is also variety in the type and colour of external materials for this set of dwellings and the style and colour of windows.

6. Consequently, these three pairs of semi-detached dwellings have material differences and are not uniform or architecturally distinctive as a set. This, along with the range of styles and scales of the other dwellings on Ludham Hall Lane, means that there is no one architecturally distinctive style to the local built environment.
7. The proposed development would introduce a two-storey front projection, a built form not seen on any of the other semi-detached dwellings in this group. There are however other examples of two-storey front projections with similar or larger scale and massing further along Ludham Hall Lane and nearby on London Road. Therefore, although different in terms of these three pairs, the proposal would not introduce an alien or incongruous form of development to the local area. Furthermore, given the existing variation even within these three pairs, the introduction of a novel form of development would not be inherently harmful.
8. The original symmetry between the appeal dwelling and its attached neighbour has already been significantly changed by alterations and extensions to No 1. Therefore, while the proposed front extension would alter the appearance of the appeal dwelling, the resulting change to the pair would not be materially harmful.
9. The proposal would also be modest in scale and in proportion with the existing dwelling, with the hipped roof set in and down and consistent with the form of the main roof. The design of the proposed extension would also allow for the original form of the main dwelling and roof to be readily appreciated. Accordingly, the proposal would be subordinate to the existing dwelling in terms of bulk, height and position and would not result in inappropriate massing.
10. As a result, the proposed development would be compatible with development in the local area. It would not cause any unacceptable impact on the identity of the appeal dwelling or street scene.
11. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the local area. Consequently, it would comply with Policies LPP 36 and LPP 52 of the Braintree District Local Plan 2013-2033, which require that the overall design, scale, form and materials of development are compatible with the original dwelling and in harmony with the character and appearance of the local area. There would also be no conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

12. I recommend the standard time period for commencement of the development condition in the interests of expediency. I also recommend a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans as this provides certainty. I further recommend a condition requiring use of matching materials to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development taking into account the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR