
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2025

by **J L Cheesley DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z1510/D/25/3370538

1 Oaklands Close, Braintree, Essex CM77 7PZ

- 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 Brine against the decision of Braintree District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00597/HH.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side extension.
-

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 surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling of traditional design. It lies within a predominately residential area of primarily two-storey detached dwellings, many of which are of a similar design to the appeal property. A strong characteristic of the surrounding streetscene is the gap at first floor level between properties, creating a sense of space above attached garages.
4. The proposed first floor side extension would be positioned above the existing side garage, set back from the main front façade and with a lower roof than the existing main roof.
5. From my observations, due to the bulk, height and position of the proposed extension, I consider that it would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure within the surrounding streetscene at first floor level. As such, it would unacceptably adversely affect the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene, by virtue of the loss of gap at first floor level between properties.
6. For the above reasons and having taken into account all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policies SP7, LPP1, LPP36 and LPP52 in the Braintree District Local Plan 2013-2033,(2022), particularly where they seek to ensure that development does not have a materially adverse effect on the existing character and appearance of an area. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where

the Framework seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character. The above policies are broadly in accordance with the Framework on this matter.

7. It must be acknowledged that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It sets out the three overarching objectives which are interdependent.
8. Turning to the economic objective, some very small benefit would accrue in relation to the construction of the proposal. In terms of the social objective, the proposal would provide additional living accommodation. However, this would not be within a well-designed built environment. I now turn to the environmental objective. For the reasons stated above, I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. The harm is so significant in terms of both the social and environmental objectives that taking the three overarching objectives together, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR