

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2017

**by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 21<sup>st</sup> September 2017**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/17/3179280**  
**97 Ingrave Road, Brentwood CM15 8BA**

- 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 Monik Gupta against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00531/FUL was refused by notice dated 16 June 2017.
  - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as a 'part single part double storey rear extension, loft development with rear dormer with juliet balcony.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

### Reasons

3. Brentwood Replacement Local Plan Policy H17 is concerned with dormer windows. The explanatory text to the policy indicates that poorly designed dormer windows can appear incongruous and detract from the appearance and profile of the property. The policy intends that if such proposals are out of scale and poorly related in design to the roof they will not be permitted. It also indicates that the design and scale of such development should ensure it remains a subsidiary rather than a dominant feature of the roof. It should also be set in from any wall and be below the ridge height. This policy applies to all cases of such development, even if they are located outside of a Conservation Area and do not concern a Listed Building, as in this instance.
  4. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling with a traditional dual pitched main roof. The rear dormer addition would be set in from the sides. The submitted rear and side elevation drawings show different gaps between the top of the proposed dormer addition and the ridge of the roof. That showing the side profile indicates a more generous space. However, the set back of the face of the dormer from the main rear wall would be absolutely minimal. In any event, the overall size and horizontal emphasis of the roof extension would result in it covering the vast majority of the rear roof slope and being excessive in scale. The two fairly large windows in the addition would further emphasise its undue dominance and top heavy nature. The fairly
-

extensive flat roof would also abruptly contrast with and detract from the pitched roof profile of the host dwelling.

5. Due to these factors, the dormer addition would appear overly dominant and poorly related to the roof, in conflict with Policy H17. As a result of these adverse effects the character and appearance of the host dwelling would be harmed.
6. The Appellant refers to dormer additions that have been permitted at 99 Ingrave Road and has submitted some photographs which I have carefully considered. The additions at the front are noticeably smaller than that now proposed. I also saw at my site visit that the top of the rear dormer extension is sloping rather than having a flat roof as now proposed. In this respect the nearby rear addition is therefore more sympathetic to the host dwelling.
7. Mention is also made of dormer additions being approved at 109A Ingrave Road. However, I have not been provided with the full details and background to either of these developments and I do not know why they were approved. It has not been demonstrated that the Council's decision making has been unreasonably inconsistent and these cases do not lend any significant support to the appeal.
8. Moreover, rather than appropriately reflecting existing development in the vicinity such a fairly large flat topped addition to the main roof would be unacceptably out of keeping with the predominantly pitched roof character and appearance of dwellings in the locality. This detrimental effect and the failure to achieve a high standard of design would be contrary to Local Plan Policy CP1 (i) and (iii).
9. I am reinforced in my view regarding the adverse impact and unacceptable nature of the development by the importance placed on design in the National Planning Policy Framework. It is a core principle that planning should always seek to secure high quality design. It is also indicated that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning, which would not be achieved in this instance.
10. Submitted correspondence shows that the original scheme was the subject of positive pre-application advice and was further amended during the application process on the basis of comment from the Council. Nevertheless, such advice is not binding on the Council and I note that the documentation submitted does not include any assessment against Policy H17. In any case, I must consider this appeal strictly on its own planning merits, having regard to the development plan.
11. This is an instance where I have found conflict with the development plan and harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality. There are no other considerations that would justify accepting the development and it is therefore determined that the appeal fails.

*M Evans*

INSPECTOR