



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/25/3362796

32 Valentine Way, Silver End, Essex CM8 3RY

- 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 Murray against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02613/HH.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension, two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Silver End Conservation Area in which the appeal property is located.

Reasons

3. The current proposal is a resubmission of a previous unsuccessful application for similar extensions¹. While I note this earlier proposal and decision, this appeal involves a separate proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
4. The original Silver End Garden Village, which comprises the conservation area, was developed between 1926 and 1932 by Francis Crittall to provide a new factory and housing for workers. It was planned using some of the principles established by the Garden City Movement.
5. Valentine Way is a principal road in Silver End and is characterised by residential terraces, in groups of eight properties, with some semi-detached dwellings. They are constructed in buff stock bricks with hipped roofs with slates and brick chimneys. The dwellings are set back from the road, and are mainly fronted by privet hedging.
6. Dwellings have undergone some limited changes, notably in the form of replacements windows and doors. To the rear this is most evident due to the addition of modest single storey extensions to a number of properties. However, overall the layout, design and appearance of the properties remains largely unchanged. As a semi-detached dwelling that reflects the wider character and

¹ Ref 22/01211/HH.

- appearance of the conservation area, No 32 makes a positive contribution to the area.
7. Spaces between the built forms is a feature of the uniform layout in Valentine Way. This is particularly the case between Nos 32 and 34 where the gap is wider than usual due to the former access road to the factory running between the two properties. As such, this gap is notable within the street scene, reflecting the historic relationship between the factory and workers' dwellings. Due to the extent of the gap, both the side extension and the two storey rear extension would be readily seen and, therefore, would be prominent in the street scene.
 8. Despite the inset and lower roof height than that of the existing dwelling, the two storey extension would add uncharacteristic bulk to the original simple built form. Consequently, the extent of this change to the original dwelling across two storeys would appear as incongruous, particularly due to the contrast with the largely uniform appearance of neighbouring dwellings. Moreover, while the side extension would be relatively modest in scale and would replace an existing wooden porch structure, its effects seen in combination with the two storey rear extension would further add to the uncharacteristic and incongruous appearance of the alterations to the original built form.
 9. Therefore, for these reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Silver End Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation². Based on the above findings, I consider the harm to be less than substantial in this instance, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
 10. Under such circumstances, the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal³. I acknowledge that the additional space created by the extension would provide an enhanced standard of accommodation. However, the harm to the designated asset is of considerable weight and, therefore, the proposal would not provide sufficient public benefits that would outweigh the harm that has been found.
 11. Reference is made to a successful appeal for a two storey rear extension at No 54 Valentine Way. However, the appeal decision has not been provided but, in any case, from the site inspection it is clear that the current proposal at No 32 would be a much more prominent addition due to the extent of views within the street scene compared to this earlier proposal. As such, the two proposals are not directly comparable and the earlier decision should not be considered a precedent with regard to the current proposal.
 12. I have had regard to the representations from interested parties in support of the proposal. However, these are not sufficient reason to set aside the above findings of harm to a designated heritage asset.
 13. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not preserve the character or appearance of the Silver End Conservation Area. Consequently, it is contrary to the following policies from the Braintree District Local Plan 2013-

² Paragraph 212.

³ Paragraph 215.

2033: SP7, which requires all new development to meet high standards of design; and LPP36 concerning alterations and extensions and LPP53 concerning conservation areas, both of which policies include the requirement for development to preserve the historic environment.

14. In reaching this conclusion I am particularly mindful of the statutory requirement that in exercising planning functions in conservation areas special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area⁴.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

⁴ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.