



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2025

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/25/3360898

10 Pointwell Lane, Coggeshall, Essex CO6 1RH

- 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 and Mrs Woollard against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02274/HH.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1st floor side extension on pillars and pitched dormers to front elevation. Erection of rear conservatory.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following submission of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024 and updated on 7 February 2025. The parts of the Framework most relevant to the appeal have not substantively changed from the previous version. As a result, I consider that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions in respect of these matters, and I am satisfied that no party's interests would be prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - ii) whether the development provides adequate provision for car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 10 Pointwell Lane is a two-storey, semi-detached property set back from the highway.
5. Properties along Pointwell Lane are primarily two-storey, semi-detached properties. There is uniformity to the front elevation of the paired dwellings in respect of their roof form and window positioning, which is also reflected in the adjacent semi-detached properties to the west of the appeal site. Plot widths vary, with the appeal property being afforded a wider parcel of land than the adjoining property, with the provision of an area of hardstanding between its side elevation and the shared boundary.

6. Along Pointwell Lane I observed a number of the residential dwellings to have been extended to the side. These extensions include a mix of single storey extensions, conservatories and lean-to garage-like structures that extend to adjoin a shared side boundary, albeit set back within their respective plot.
7. The stilted extension would be an unsympathetic form of development that would be visually discordant with the design and form of the existing dwelling, adjoining semi-detached property and the prevailing street scene. Furthermore, owing to the recessed position of no 8, the side elevation of the appeal property is prominent within the streetscene when approaching from the west. Consequently, this element of the proposal would be viewed as an incongruous addition, highly prominent within the streetscene.
8. The width and roof height the proposed extension, combined with it set back from the front elevation, would ensure that the proposal would read as a subordinate addition to the host property. Furthermore, the proposed dormer window and external materials would be in keeping with the existing property. Accordingly, when viewed from the site frontage the proposed extension would not appear as a dominant feature. Having regard to these factors and the plot width, I do not find that the proposal would unacceptably unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings. These factors, however, are not sufficient to overcome the harm identified.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Conflict therefore arises with Policy LPP36 of the Braintree District Local Plan 2013 – 2033 (LP) that requires residential alterations and extensions to be of a design, siting, bulk, form and materials compatible with the original dwelling and character of the area. Similarly, I find conflict with Policy LPP52 of the LP and the Framework, which collectively, amongst other things, require a high standard of layout and design in all new development that respects and responds to the local context.

Parking

10. Policy LPP43 of the LP states that development will be required to provide vehicular and cycle parking in accordance with the Essex Vehicle Parking Standards. The Essex County Council Parking Standards (ECCPS) states that a 2-bed+ dwellings should provide 2 parking spaces per unit.
11. The appeal site includes a front garden enclosed by low walls and an area of hardstanding to the side of the appeal property. In this location the appeal boundary is tapered in towards the dwelling.
12. The application form states that the existing parking arrangements would not be affected. The appellant states that 3no cars can be parked on the site. However, the plans annotate 1no vehicle parking space.
13. I recognise that the ECCPS states that a parking space can include undercroft parking and car ports providing they have no other use. Be that as it may, having regard to the submitted plans, and my observations at my site visit, I am not persuaded that 2no vehicles could be parked clear of the highway. The proposed development would therefore fail to comply with the Council's adopted parking standards.

14. Pointwell Lane is a narrow lane, unable to accommodate on-street parking. Consequently, parking needs arising from the proposed development could not be accommodated within the public highway without compromising highway safety.
15. The Council's guidance goes on to state that reductions of the vehicle standard may be considered if development is within an urban area that has good links to sustainable transport. However, in this circumstance the appeal site lies outside of a settlement. Moreover, I am not satisfied that parking provision on the public highway could be accommodated due to the nature of the local roads proximate to the appeal site.
16. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the appeal scheme would fail to make adequate arrangements for car parking. This draws the proposal in conflict with Policy LPP43 of the LP and the ECCPS.

Other Matters

17. In addition to the two-storey side extension, I have had regard to the other elements of the proposed development, to which the Council raised no issues. Having regards to the amount of development proposed, its design and relationship with neighbouring properties, I see no reason to disagree.

Conclusion

18. There are no considerations which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons detailed above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

R. Gee

INSPECTOR