
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/17/3180298

2 Cedar Close, Hutton, Brentwood CM13 1NE

- 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 Lambert against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00814/FUL was refused by notice dated 14 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is an extension to a chalet bungalow with a new dormer at the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to a chalet bungalow with a new dormer at the first floor in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00814/FUL, dated 26 May 2017, 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: 621/07, 08, 09A, 10A, 11A and 12A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. 2 Cedar Close is a semi-detached chalet bungalow sitting in an elevated position at the junction with Cedar Road. This is a relatively tightly built up residential area with a variety of chalet bungalows. The proposal would add a narrow side extension facing Cedar Close, change the hipped roof to a half hip and put a large box dormer window structure on the rear roof slope.
4. The side extension would bring the building slightly closer to Cedar Close, but would stop short of the edge of footway. The building would remain low in

height so that it would not be an overly dominant structure in views from the street. Spacious corner plots are not a particular feature of the area and this minor change would not significantly close down views or appear out of character.

5. There are a number of other half hipped roofs and full gables in the local area and the proposed half hip would fit in well in this context. The pair of bungalows is already imbalanced to some extent by a large ground floor extension to other half. I see no overriding need to maintain a symmetrical form at roof level within this architecturally varied area.
6. The dormer proposed here would fit comfortably within the extended roof, being set well down from the ridge line, in at the sides and up from the eaves. It would be prominent in the street scene, but no more so than many others. Box dormers are common in the area, including many on front roof slopes.
7. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the building or the local area. It therefore accords with the aims of Brentwood Replacement Local Plan Policies CP1 and H17, to ensure that extensions are of high quality design, compatible with the building and surrounding development in terms of size, siting, scale, style, design and materials and that dormer windows are not out of scale or poorly related in design to the roof. It would likewise accord with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on securing high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness.
8. The stated purpose of the proposal is to improve the property's accommodation to help meet the needs of a disabled person, including the provision of accommodation for a live-in carer. The Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010 requires decision makers to have due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity for persons with a relevant protected characteristic, which includes disabilities. I find that the existing accommodation here is not well laid out to meet reasonable needs and that the proposal would significantly improve the situation. This reinforces my overall conclusion.
9. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring the use of matching materials to protect the character and appearance of the local area. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR