The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2017

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DiP TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23rd February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/16/3165800
9 Queenswood Avenue, Hutton CM13 1HR

- 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 Peter Barclay against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
- The application ref: 16/01392/FUL, dated 11 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2016.
- The proposal is described as the 'demolishment of the existing single storey detached garage to the side of the property for the development of a two storey side extension. This will be developed to allow for a larger kitchen space and internal garage at ground floor level and then an extra bedroom with en-suite at first floor level. Further the removal of the existing front elevation porch, this will be redeveloped and will form across the front elevation and proposed extension as per the plans. This will be developed with a hipped roof structure.'

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing single storey detached garage to the side of the property for the development of a two storey side extension; and the removal of the existing porch on the front elevation and the erection of a new porch, at 9 Queenswood Avenue, Hutton CM13 1HR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01392/FUL, dated 11 October 2016, 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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, and, drawing nos. 4090-2A Rev 001 and 4270-3A Rev 001.

Procedural Matter

2. I have noted the lengthy description of the development given on the application and appeal forms. However in the interests of clarity and succinctness, and to omit references to the scheme's merits, I have compressed that description as set out in my formal decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the semi-detached pair, and the area.

Reasons

4. No. 9 Queenswood Avenue ('No. 9') sits within a residential area which is predominantly characterised by semi-detached dwellings or short terraces which are set back from the highway behind front gardens and driveways. Many of the buildings are of a broadly similar style, and are typically finished with brick, or a mix of brick and light coloured render.

5. No. 9 forms one half of a semi-detached pair. There is a gap on the other side to a short terrace. The roof form, and the ridge and eaves heights of the proposed two storey extension would match those on the host property. Its articulated gable would be the same depth as the host, and its front face at first floor would align. Although the proposed porch would project to the front, and would be larger than the porch it would replace, it would have a relatively modest single storey height, with a hipped roof which would limit its mass.

6. At Appendix 2 of his statement the appellant has provided photographs of extensions of a similar style to his proposal. Some of those dwellings are a little way from this one, but I did observe nearby two storey side extensions which are not set back from their host property's front face, or set down from the ridge line, at nos. 6 and 8 Queenswood Avenue, no. 26 Pinewood Way and no. 2 Storr Gardens. Some of those examples also have front porches which extend across the extended property's full length. Given those and other local examples, and the varied length of the buildings' front elevations, the proposed extensions here would not appear out of place or discordant in the streetscene.

7. Whilst no. 11 Queenswood Avenue ('No. 11') has not been extended to the side, given this two storey extension's similar form, the additional length here would not cause significant harm to the pair's balance or harmony. Furthermore, although the proposed use of white coloured render as the main facing material would differ from no. 11, that contrast would visually break-up the building's length.

8. Policy CP1 parts (i) and (iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 requires, in broad terms, that development does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area; and that it be of a high design standard which is compatible with its location, and with the existing building. Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('Framework') takes a broadly similar stance. Subservience is not a requirement of either policy, and the scheme would not conflict with them.

9. The Council has not drawn my attention to any particular part of the Planning Practice Guidance, and for reasons above the scheme would not conflict with its general advice on good design and promoting townscape character. The appeal will therefore be allowed.

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions against the Framework's tests. In addition to the standard time limit condition, as it provides certainty, I

have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings. Although the Council has suggested a condition requiring that the extensions be faced with matching materials, that is not what is indicated on the application form and drawings; and for the reasons given I do not consider it to be necessary.

11. Summing up, the scheme would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property, this semi-detached pair, or the area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR