
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2016

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28TH December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/16/3158969

3 Cliveden Close, Brentwood, Essex CM15 8JP

- 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 and Mrs Ashton against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00875/FUL, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first and second floor front extension, pitched roof to existing garage, single/two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of the development in reaching my decision as it more fully describes the details of the development than that given on the original planning application form. The appellants appeal form also makes reference to the updated description. I shall determine the appeal on this basis accordingly.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front extensions on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey Arts and Crafts style house set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway. The property is located in a mature well-established residential area on a cul-de-sac, typically characterised by large detached properties.
 5. The proposal would entail the construction of a new front gable extension with a half-hipped roof and a new pitched roof over the forward-projecting garage. It would be extended forward broadly in line with the original front elevation and above the existing eave heights of the house. A part single storey and part two storey extension is proposed at the rear of the house.
 6. The appeal property is in a relatively large plot. The extensions would therefore not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The front extension, however, extending across the eastern part of the front elevation would still be a significant addition relative to the main house and, combined
-

with the garage below, would result in substantial bulk on this side of the dwelling. As such, although set down at roof level, I consider that the proposed front gable extension, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, above the existing front eaves of the house, would significantly detract from the attractive form and appearance of the host property and result in an incongruous and out-of-keeping addition to the street scene.

7. I have considered the appellants comments regarding the context provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) for good design and pursuing sustainable form of development that would provide for the different needs within the community, improve the family's living space and living conditions. However, I consider that these factors would not mitigate the overall harm this scheme would cause to the character and appearance of the host property and the area nor achieve the standards of design the Framework seeks to promote. It is also not a sustainable form of development for which the Framework makes a presumption in favour.
8. I have considered the appellants arguments regarding the scale and the design of the proposed extension being in keeping with the existing house and the other properties in the area. Whilst the use of matching materials, fenestrations and the retention of the catslide roof on the western part of the front elevation would assist in integrating the extension with the design of the existing dwelling, these aspects do not overcome the adverse effects outlined above. I also note the appellants comments regarding the lack of formal objections from the neighbours, third parties and the Council's design officer. Whilst this maybe so, this does not set a precedent for such an inappropriate development in this location. I therefore accord these matters limited weight.
9. I have noted the front extensions in the area drawn to my attention by the appellants. The gable extensions at Nos. 1 and 2 Cliveden Close and the gable extensions with full hipped roofs at No. 4 Cliveden Close have different development characteristics and are not directly comparable with the appeal scheme. I therefore accord them limited weight as precedents in this case.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed gabled roof front extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005. This policy, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations are of a high standard of design and compatible with the existing building and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In addition, it would not accord with the Framework that development should seek to secure a high quality of design (paragraph 17); to respect the local character (paragraph 58); and to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness (paragraph 60).

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR