
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/19/3239990

53 Woodway, Hutton CM13 2JR

- 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 and Mrs Deverill against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00870/FUL, dated 17 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single/two-storey front, side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling with a flat roofed single-storey detached garage located adjacent to the main house. The surrounding area is residential in nature and is largely made up of detached and link detached properties of a mixed style and appearance. Many of the immediate dwellings surrounding the appeal site also have a flat roofed garage to the side of the dwelling, creating a natural first floor gap between those properties.
5. As well as extensions to the front and rear of the property, the proposal includes the demolition of the existing garage to be replaced with a two-storey side extension which would be located approximately 1 metre from the boundary with No.51 Woodway and about 2 metres from the neighbouring dwelling itself. Although some properties along Woodway have a similarly sized gaps to their neighbours, these are in the minority and, as set out above, the majority of houses in this part of the road have separate garages at the side of the property, including on this east side of the road, above which there are large gaps. This gives the street scene a pleasant, spacious and loose knit

- appearance which has a positive impact on the character of the area. As the proposal would result in the loss of the visual gap above the garage, the positive impact would be lost with the appeal site and neighbouring properties appearing less spacious within the street scene.
6. I note the appellant considers that the 1 metre gap to the boundary provided by the extension would be 'normal' and that only a further 0.2 metres is required in the Hutton Mount area which, they advise, is locally known for its prestigious character. Nonetheless, this does not necessarily suggest that gaps of less than 1.2 metres would be acceptable here as each area will undoubtedly have their own differing characteristics. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the character of its own surroundings.
 7. It is noted that the proposal would create a larger gap to the boundary at ground floor level by demolishing the garage. However, the visual benefit at ground level would be limited and would not overcome the more visually significant loss of separation between the properties at first floor level. The appellant's discussions with the Council are also noted and I understand that a reduction in the width of the side extension would be impractical. However, this does not affect my view of the proposal.
 8. A number of similar developments within the area have been highlighted by the appellant, specifically an extension at No.29 Princes Way which maintains a 1 metre gap at first floor level. However, this site is some distance from the appeal site and the extension slightly different in design, and therefore is not directly comparable to the appeal before me. The other developments listed within the appellant's statement are also on different roads or different parts of Woodway, and so are seen in a different setting to the appeal site. Furthermore, proposals should be assessed individually and on their own merit.
 9. The Council have stated that the flank wall material would be part render and therefore would be at odds with the local palette of materials. However, the appellant has confirmed that both flank walls would be constructed fully of brick and therefore would be in keeping with the existing dwelling.
 10. Nonetheless, for the reasons above, I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to policy CP1 criteria (i) and (iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (2005) which ensures that new development does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on visual amenity or the character and appearance of the surrounding area and that the proposal should be of a high standard of design and compatible with its location. It would also be contrary to the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR