
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/W/17/3167648

90 Long Ridings Avenue, Hutton, CM13 1EG

- 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 Danny Dawson against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01359/FUL, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a new 2 bed dwelling on the side of 90 Long Ridings Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises garden land to the side of a semi-detached dwelling at 90 Long Ridings Avenue. The plot lies at the corner of Long Ridings Avenue and Woodland Avenue. The surrounding area is characterised by semi-detached and terraced houses and bungalows. Dwellings are generally set back from highways with front gardens and individual driveways leading to garages. My attention has been drawn to terraced properties in Woodland Avenue and Arnolds Avenue close to the highway but these are the exceptions to the prevailing character and appearance surrounding the appeal site. By reason of this frontage pattern of development, there is attractive spacious quality along streets.
 4. The extension to form a separate dwelling would result in a loss of space at the corner of Long Ridings Avenue and Woodlands Avenue. By virtue of the extent of the extension's footprint, there would be little space between its flank and boundary fence alongside Woodlands Avenue, especially to the rear. This built form would substantially reduce the space to the side of the dwelling which is a feature of street frontage and being two storey, the extension would be prominent and intrusive given that dwellings are generally set back along Woodlands Avenue.
-

5. Opposite the appeal property, there is a dwelling in a similar corner location which has been extended at two storey level to the side and rear. However, the extension to the side is smaller and based on what I saw on my site visit, there would be a greater gap between the flank of the extension and boundary fence. Consequently, this existing development does not detract from the spacious quality of the area in the same way that the proposal would.
6. In conclusion, the development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area for the reasons indicated. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with policy CP1 (i)(iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005, which collectively and amongst other matters, requires no unacceptable detrimental impact on visual amenity, or on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, a high standard of design and compatibility with its location and any surrounding development, in terms of size, siting, scale, design and materials.
7. The proposal would result in a dwelling boosting housing supply which the Appellant indicates is much needed in this location. The location of the dwelling would have good accessibility to services and facilities. However there would be a significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area by reason of the design of the development for the reasons indicated. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The benefit of the development would be limited by reason of only one dwelling being created. It has been indicated that the Council does not have a five year supply of housing land. Even if I were to conclude this and that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date, the adverse impact of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits for the reasons indicated. Thus, the development would not be sustainable.
8. The proposal is a re-submission of an earlier proposal with revised roof and elevation design. Whilst I acknowledge the current proposal seeks to address the Council's objections on this earlier proposal, I have come to my own conclusions as indicated above. The extension would be designed to match the existing dwelling and there would be landscaping but such features would not outweigh the conflict with the development plan. In any case, they are normal planning requirements to be complied with in schemes and as such, have neutral bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

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

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR