



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/20/3259995

10 Tyler Way, Brentwood, CM14 4WE

- 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 Morskyj against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00625/HHA, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is raise existing ridge line to incorporate loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern two storey end of terrace dwelling. It is located in a residential area within a modern housing estate, characterised by the presence of similar two storey houses set within short terraces.
 4. Houses in the area tend to be set back from the street behind very short garden areas, with longer gardens to the rear. Courtyard and on-street parking is common to the estate.
 5. During my site visit, I observed that the similar designs of dwellings, the use of matching brick and tile materials and the similar heights, fenestration and roofs of properties all combine to provide the area with an attractive sense of uniformity.
 6. Many of the short terraces in the area are characterised by a staggered effect, such that individual dwellings are often set slightly in front, or behind, adjacent dwellings. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling and is staggered such that it steps back from Number 9 Tyler Way, adjacent.
 7. The proposal would result in the raising of the appeal property's ridge height and the addition of a large rear dormer.
-

8. I find that together, the raising of the ridge height and the addition of the large dormer would result in a development that would appear in contrast to the rest of the terrace and the more uniform attributes of the area.
9. The raised roof would alter the angle of the roof pitch. This would result in the appeal property appearing at odds with other dwellings in the terrace, unbalancing the roofline and leading the roof of the appeal property to draw attention to itself as an incongruous feature.
10. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed dormer appearing as an unduly prominent and dominant feature, due to its position on a raised roof and its significant scale, whereby it would extend across almost the whole width of the roof as a tall, prominent and boxy feature.
11. Consequently, the proposal would appear as an intrusive addition that would draw attention to itself as a dominant feature and would detract from the attractive uniform qualities of the area.
12. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and to Local Plan¹ Policies CP1 and H17, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

13. In support of the proposal, the appellants draw my attention to other developments elsewhere. I observed nearby developments during my site visit and noted that, whilst there were some similarities to the proposal before me, there were also differences. Notwithstanding this, I have found that the proposal before me would harm local character, leading to the decision below.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (2005).