



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/25/3369201

144 Springfield Park Road, Chelmsford, CM2 6EE

- 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 I Ford against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00634/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and front extension, detached carport with formation of access. Single storey incidental annexe.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey side and front extension, detached carport with formation of access. Single storey incidental annexe at 144 Springfield Park Road, Chelmsford, CM2 6EE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00634/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials used in the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The annexe building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 144 Springfield Park Road.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed side and front extension on the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house situated on a corner at the junction of Springfield Park Road with Springfield Park Hill, within the urban area of Chelmsford. It occupies a large plot, the majority of which extends to the west. Beyond the western boundary is Trinity Primary School with a modern single storey addition under mono-pitched roofs. On the opposite side of Springfield Park Road there is a building in commercial use.
4. The proposed detached carport would be visible from public areas, as would the annexe, although the latter would be partly hidden by the carport. Both would be of single storey and of simple form. The council regards them, and the repositioned

access, as acceptable, and I share that view. The remainder of this decision will therefore concentrate on the single storey side and front extension.

5. Chelmsford Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework require high quality design. Policy DM23 of the Local Plan states that planning permission will be granted for development that respects the character and appearance of the area in which it is located, and stipulates a number of criteria against which proposals will be judged. The council's 'Making Places' Supplementary Planning Document (section 8) provides guidance that householder side extensions should relate well to the host building and be subservient, follow a similar style of detailing and not unbalance the building. It is against these policies that the proposal must be judged.
6. Along Springfield Park Road to the east, the housing is almost entirely 2-storey semi-detached dwellings, closely spaced and with limited front gardens which are largely given over to car parking. They were clearly built as part of an estate development, having a cohesive appearance. The houses on the western side of the short Springfield Park Hill appear to have been part of the original estate development. The appeal property and its neighbours around the junction of Springfield Park Road with Springfield Park Hill, the latter running at an angle, have the same basic architectural form, but have a more spacious setting.
7. The side and front extension would project approximately 1.9m beyond the front wall of the house and 4.9m beyond the side wall of the property. It would have a hipped roof form as it wraps round from the front to the side, but the final part of the side extension at the rear, about 1.8m in length, would be under a flat roof. External facing would be matching materials to the house consisting of concrete roof tiles and painted rendered walls.
8. Because of the spacious nature of the site, its orientation, and the commercial premises opposite and school next door, the appeal site does not read strongly with the majority of the estate that I have described. It is the case that a subservient front extension, of itself, would not be incompatible with the character and appearance of the area. In this case the hipped roof form over most of the proposed front and side extension, and the materials proposed, make the proposed extensions visually coherent. The front extension would be 'active' in that it would have doors and windows, rather than blank walls. The flat roofed element at the rear is less satisfactory, but it is fairly unobtrusive in its location. Whilst the width of the front elevation of the proposal would be substantial in comparison to the width of the existing house, the angle and extent of garden frontage to Springfield Park Road is able to absorb this in the context of the pair of semi-detached houses.
9. The conclusion I reach is that the proposed single storey side and front extension would be compatible with its surroundings, having regard to scale, siting, form, architecture, materials, boundary treatments and landscape. The appeal site does not read strongly with the bulk of the estate when read in the context of the wide open frontage to the west. The hipped roof and matching materials give coherence and a subservient form, and provide an active elevation to the road. Therefore the proposed side and front extension meets the requirements of Policy DM23 of the Local Plan and follows the guidance in the 'Making Places' Supplementary Planning Document. As a subsidiary matter I also note that there is a front extension, in the form of a porch, and a side extension on the house at No.138

Springfield Park Road, which provides a degree of precedent to the extent that the appeal proposal reflects other development on the other side of the junction. For these reasons the appeal will be allowed.

Conditions

10. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance. The first of the suggested conditions is that the materials match those of the existing building, and the second is that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I consider that the first of these should be imposed to ensure that the development achieves a coherent relationship with the existing house. The second is necessary for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted, but it can be incorporated in the terms of the permission itself.
11. Whilst this decision has focussed on the side and front extension, I must not overlook that the development being permitted includes a single storey “incidental” annexe. The annexe would function independently of the host property, which given its siting in the rear garden, would rely on the amenity provision, access and parking which serves the house. The permission granted is on the basis of an essential link with the host dwelling, and it would not be appropriate to allow for a separate dwelling, unassociated with the existing dwelling, to be formed. For this reason it is necessary to impose a condition which ties the annexe to the house in perpetuity.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR