



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2020

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/20/3254105

16 Heybridge Road, Ingatestone, CM4 9AG

- 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 Gillian Brotherwood against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00273/FUL, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is Loft conversion and part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At my site visit I noted that a loft conversion and single storey rear extension to the dwelling have been constructed. The rear dormer that has been constructed differs from that shown on the application drawings, in terms of the number and size of window openings within the dormer. I shall therefore determine the appeal on the basis of the submitted application drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal concerns 16 Heybridge Road which is a detached dwelling. The proposal is for a loft conversion which involves a hip to gable roof and dormer window to the rear, together with a single storey flat roof extension and other minor door and fenestration changes.
5. I note that hipped roofs are a particularly distinctive feature of the semi-detached properties along this part of Heybridge Road although there are also examples of hip to gable roof extensions. However, 16 Heybridge Road is a detached property and I concur with the view of the Council that the hipped to gable extension would not be harmful to the existing street scene. Furthermore, the single storey rear extension is of limited depth and is acceptable in terms of its design and appearance.
6. The dormer window would be set down from the ridge of the dwelling by only a small amount. It would also continue along much of the width of the property

with only a minor set in from the flank elevations. The dormer would dominate the roof slope and would also extend down almost as far as the original eaves of the dwelling. As a result, the dormer would appear as a bulky addition to the dwelling that would completely dominate the rear roofscape.

7. The rear dormer would be highly visible when viewed from Rye Walk to the rear of the site. Whilst I acknowledge that there are other dormer additions in the area, the proposed dormer at No 16 would be particularly large and dominating and as such would be harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area.
8. I therefore find that the rear dormer window would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy H17 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (LP) which states that the design and scale of a dormer window should remain a subsidiary rather than dominant feature of the roof, be set in from any wall of the property and be below ridge height. The proposal also conflicts with Policy CP1 of the LP insofar as it seeks a high standard of design and resists proposals which have a detrimental impact on visual amenity.

Conclusion

9. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR