

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/16/3157267

11 Priests Field, Ingrave, Essex CM13 3QJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms T Finn against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/01566/FUL, dated 27 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to create family annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a two storey structure that would be connected to the existing dwelling by a single storey link, accommodating the ground floor hallway. This layout would result in the two storey extension appearing as a distinct and visually separate new element of development. Although it would not extend forward of the neighbouring house, its forward position in comparison to the host dwelling would substantially increase its prominence when viewed from the street.
 4. The height, width and form of the two storey addition would respect the proportions of the main dwelling. The design, including the feature gable, would add some interest to its appearance. However, the independent appearance of the two storey element would result in it appearing cramped within this setting. The uncharacteristic layout would be at odds with the existing character of this area. This unsatisfactory relationship would be emphasised by its forward position in relation to the main part of the house. The overall composition would represent poor design in this context and it would detract from the character of the dwelling and the wider area.
 5. I acknowledge that there are examples of other relatively large extensions in the area. However, I did not find any to result in a visually separate structure, forward of the main building line. The proposal differs significantly from the examples provided. Although innovative new design can offer benefits in certain situations, in this case, the proposal would be at odds with the
-

character and appearance of the area and it would detract from the setting and form of the host dwelling.

6. The proposal would conflict with the design requirements of Policy CP1 (i & iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 as it would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and it would be incompatible with its location. As the policy generally accords with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford it considerable weight. The *Framework* is also clear that permission should be refused for development of poor design. Given the design shortcomings, the proposal does not represent sustainable development.
7. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant but they are insufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR