



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/25/3374328

10 Souther Cross Road, Good Easter, Chelmsford, Essex CM1 4RX

- 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 P Ivey against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01032/FUL.
 - The development proposed is construction of open-sided car port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the open-sided car port on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Number 10 is a semi-detached house at the end of a section of ribbon development running evenly on both sides of Souther Cross Road. Farmland separates this housing from nearby Good Easter village. The car port for which permission is sought is already in place. It occupies the front parking area immediately in front of the house, served by an adjacent site entrance.
4. Although at one end of the row of dwellings along this side of the road, with open countryside beyond, this semi-detached house is an integral part of this well-defined group. As such, it is not within such a fringe location as to reduce the car port's visual impact within this housing enclave. The double car port is at a prominent entrance point to this clearly defined section of ribbon development. Although the dwellings are all set back quite comfortably from the road, the car port occupies a substantial part of the front garden to No 10, which is far too small for a structure of this size to be effectively lost to view. On the contrary, where placed it comprises a visually dominant and incompatible feature. The fact the front garden physically accommodates the structure seems immaterial. That it occupies most of the space between the roadside garden wall and the front elevation the house means it is quite evidently a cramped physical and visual presence, contrary to the appellant's assertion otherwise.
5. The open nature of the car port, and the fact that cars would be seen parked in this location regardless of its presence, does not overcome the harmful effect of such a prominent and incongruous feature. Undoubtedly, a more solid building might have caused greater harm, but this provides no reasonable mitigation for the adverse impacts found.

6. The timber framework supporting a flat roof comprises a discordant and unsympathetic feature in the street scene, detracting from the quite open and verdant setting of this section of housing, which otherwise observes a consistent building line along both sides of the road. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy DM23 of the Chelmsford Local Plan, insofar as this requires development to be compatible with its surroundings having regard to scale, siting and form. The conflict with this policy attracts significant weight due to its consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework, and its objectives for achieving well-designed places and resisting development failing in this regard.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal does not succeed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR