
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/16/3158314

6 Beech Avenue, Brentwood, Essex CM13 2DS

- 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 Jason Hayward against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00477/FUL, dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable on existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the gable roof to the two storey side extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to gable roof to the two storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for hip to gable on existing extension at 6 Beech Avenue, Brentwood, Essex CM13 2DS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00477/FUL, dated 22 April 2016 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan insofar as it is relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: SJH Design plan tilted 'Hip to gable on side and rear elevations' dated 20/4/16.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the part of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is one of a semi-detached pair of two storey dwellings. It has a two storey side extension as well as other additions. In common with others in this row of dwellings, the building has a steeply sloping hipped roof. This roof form is strongly characteristic of the area and contributes positively to local distinctiveness. It is replicated in the existing two storey extension. The
-

appeal proposal is to convert the hipped roofs of the existing side extension and the two storey rear extension to gables.

4. The appellant has referred to the shops at the junction of Orchard Avenue and Beech Avenue, Juniper Court and the maisonettes in Beech Avenue which have gabled roofs. However, in each case, the buildings were originally constructed with gabled roofs and they do not form part of a row of otherwise hipped roof buildings. Consequently, they are not comparable with the appeal property.
5. Whilst other nearby properties have two storey side extensions, for the most part, they have hipped roofs. Only 14 Beech Avenue has a full gabled main roof clearly visible from the street. 7 Orchard Avenue has a half hipped main roof. However, in both cases, the roof shapes are at odds with their neighbours and disrupt the otherwise pleasing continuity of hipped roofs in the rows of dwellings. As such, they do not provide a convincing justification for the introduction of further hip to gable extensions of main roofs.
6. The gable roof proposed to the side extension of the appeal property would form part of the main roof of the building and would be similarly prominent and incongruous in the street scene. Accordingly, I find that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, that part of the proposal would conflict with Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 (LP) Policy CP1 (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 it accord with paragraphs 56 to 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to the extent that they have similar aims.
7. The gable roof proposed to the rear existing extension would be glimpsed in views through the gap between the appeal property and No 4. However, it would be located a considerable distance behind the front of the building and would not be conspicuous in the street scene. It would be visible from the rear windows and rear gardens of neighbouring properties. However, on one side, No 4 is angled away from the appeal property. On the other side, the extended roof would be set back a reasonable distance from the boundary with No 8. As such, I consider that the gabled roof proposed on the rear extension would not be prominent in views from either property.
8. I also note that the two storey rear extension has been reduced in length compared with the scheme which was refused planning permission under Council reference 14/01084/FUL. Therefore, whilst the current proposal would add somewhat to the bulk of the appeal property and would not match the prevailing roof form in the row of dwellings, given its discreet siting, I consider that it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, this part of the proposal would not conflict with LP Policy CP1 (i) and (iii) or with Framework paragraphs 56 to 58.

Other Matter

9. The appellant states that the proposal is required to accommodate elderly parents. However, no details of those needs or floor plans showing how such need would be facilitated by the appeal proposal have been provided. Accordingly, I give this matter limited weight.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested a list of conditions in the event that the development is found to be acceptable. I find that they meet the tests set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. A condition specifying the approved plan is necessary in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match the existing building is required in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the gable roof on the side extension would be unacceptable. However, the gable roof to the rear extension would be unobjectionable and the two parts of the proposal are clearly severable. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal should fail in relation to the gable roof to the side extension, but should succeed with regard to the gable roof to the rear extension.

Simon Warder

INSPECTOR