
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2017

by Cullum J A Parker BA(Hons) MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 11th September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/W/17/3173431

1 Hawthorn Avenue, Brentwood, Essex CM13 2EE

- 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 Paul O'Hare against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01517/FUL, dated 27 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene, and;
 - The effect of the proposed development on living conditions of future occupiers with specific regard to vehicle movements and internal space.

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme seeks the erection of a two storey side extension to 1 Hawthorn Avenue, which is a semi-detached house with hipped roof. This would result in the creation of a two bedroom dwelling attached to its side. To the front is a proposed parking area to be shared with 1 Hawthorn Avenue, and to the side and rear a triangular shaped garden area. The extension would involve the extension of the existing roof style and continue both the eaves and retain the lines of both the front and rear elevations. More widely, the dwelling is located on a wider planned post war residential estate which, whilst having variations in the styles of dwellings, clearly retains a visual uniformity.
4. The proposed two storey extension would not appear as an extension to No 1 Hawthorn Avenue as it would fail to be subservient to its overall form. This is typically achieved by design techniques such as the lowering of ridge heights or the stepping back of front elevations for example. The proposal here does not seek to appear as an extension, but rather a continuation of the semi-detached form which results in the creation of a terrace.
5. Not only does this approach erode the fairly open and spacious plot afforded to the appeal building, but it would directly conflict with the prevailing pattern of

development within the street scene, where on the whole such gaps have been retained at two storey level. This visual incongruity is worsened by the provision of two parking spaces, which even on the scaled drawings appear rather tight; as shown on drawing 4991/11A. The loss of the open corner plot would be at odds with the overall character of the street scene, where there is a fairly consistent rhythm in plots sizes, with those on the corners set at an angle and therefore appearing as wider. The proposal would detrimentally erode this characteristic.

6. Internally, the Council have directed me to the DCLG *Technical Housing Space Standards* March 2015 (THSS), and consider that the proposal would be about 16sqm or 22% below the THSS standard they have applied. I acknowledge that these figures should be used as a guide rather than prescriptive and they do not form part of the policy framework. Nonetheless, they provide a good indication of the minimum sizes that should be generally sought for new dwellings. In this respect, when considered in the context of both the internal and external design, it is clear that the proposed dwelling would fail to provide a good standard of amenity for future occupiers.
7. I have considered the photos submitted by the appellant, who considers that these provide justification for the proposal in this case. However, it is evident that not only are some of these properties of a differing style, but they are situated within different contexts. In considering each proposal on its own merits, I do not find that these examples provide justification for the appeal scheme before me. I note that the proposal would provide a benefit in providing one dwelling to the overall housing land supply.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and on the living condition of future occupiers. The Council acknowledges it is not able to currently demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. With regards to Paragraph 14¹ of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), I find that the adverse impacts identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.
9. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy CP1 of the *Brentwood Replacement Local Plan* 2005 which amongst other aims seeks to ensure that proposals would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on visual amenity or the character and appearance of the surrounding area and that proposal should be of a high standard. For similar reasons it would conflict with Policies of the Framework including Paragraphs 17, 59, 60 and 64, which include promoting or reinforcing local distinctiveness and always seeking to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity.
10. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the adopted development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision otherwise. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Cullum J A Parker

INSPECTOR

¹ Engaged by Paragraph 49 of the Framework