

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2016

by Simon Warder MA BSc(Hons) DipUD(Dist) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/16/3157211

3 Paglesfield, Hutton, Essex CM13 1BQ

- 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 Mr James Draper against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/01591/FUL, dated 10 September 2015, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to front of the house to extend the dining room to be in line with the front of the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace dwelling with a single storey flat roofed projection that extends across slightly more than half the width of the front elevation. It is typical of the properties in this, and the adjoining terrace. The flat roofed front projections give the row notable degree of visual continuity which contributes positively to local distinctiveness.
 4. The proposed extension would infill the remainder of the front elevation to the same depth as the existing projection and a pitched lean to roof would extend across the full width of the building. Whilst the infilling itself would be relatively unobtrusive, the lean to roof would introduce a large and uncharacteristic built form in a prominent position. It would disrupt the continuity of the terraces and appear as an incongruous feature.
 5. The appellant has drawn my attention to pitched roof extensions to nearby properties. However, none of those properties sit within terraces which have the same degree of continuity as the appeal property and its neighbours. It has also been suggested that other occupiers in the area are considering similar extensions. However, my decision must be based on the current situation. Whether a flat or pitched roof would be preferable in any particular case will depend on the setting of each individual proposal. In this case, the use of flat roofs over the front projections is strongly characteristic of the area.
-

6. Consequently, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of host building and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 Policy CP1 criteria (i) and (iii) which require development to be of a high standard of design, compatible with its surroundings and to not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. Nor would the proposal accord with paragraphs 56 to 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework to the extent that they have similar aims.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR