



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/20/3246927

1A Doddinghurst Road, Brentwood Essex CM15 9EJ.

- 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 & Mrs D Walsh against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01566/FUL, dated 8 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing detached garage and construction of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the street scene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 3 Doddinghurst Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a modest semi-detached property with detached single storey flat roofed garage to the side. It is located along a residential road which contains a varied style and size of dwellings. No. 3 lies to the east of the appeal site and is a detached single storey bungalow which lies at a lower ground level relative to the appeal site reflecting the slope of the land and road. The garage is located on the boundary with this property.
4. The proposed two storey extension, which would involve the removal of the garage, would be set away from this common boundary by around one metre; however, it would extend to the whole depth of the existing dwelling, further back into the site than the existing garage, albeit set further away from the boundary.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed extension would occupy much of the existing 'visual' gap to the side of the property, particularly as a result of the first-floor element. However, whilst it would be noticeable in the street scene, it would be set away from the boundary, this distance being greater to the front, due to the angled position of the boundary, where it would be more readily visible in the street scene. Furthermore, it would appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling. Although it would introduce a greater amount of built form to the side of the dwelling, given the above and that the adjoining property is a

bungalow and set at a lower level than the dwelling on the appeal site, I do not consider that it would unacceptably diminish or detract from the open character of the area.

6. I therefore find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene. It would therefore comply with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (2005) (RLP) which seeks to ensure that new development does not have an unacceptable impact on visual amenity, or the character and appearance of the surrounding area and is of a high standard of design, compatible with its location.

Living conditions

7. As noted above, the existing detached garage which is to be demolished is located right on the boundary with the adjoining property, No. 3 Doddinghurst Road which, as noted above, lies at a lower level. There are a number of windows in the side elevation of this bungalow which face towards this boundary. Of particular note is a large habitable room window, roughly centrally positioned along this flank, which looked to be the sole window to that room; others towards the rear of the property appeared to be secondary windows and smaller windows towards the front of the property were obscurely glazed.
8. The position and height of the existing garage is such that there appeared to be a reasonable amount of light and outlook maintained for that main window. However, the proposed extension, which would extend further back into the site and which would be much higher and bulkier than the existing flat roofed garage, would in my opinion, have a significantly harmful impact on the amount of light received by that window. Furthermore, it would result in the outlook from that window being dominated by the high, blank side wall of the proposed extension, the effect of which would be exacerbated by the higher ground level at which it would be built. This impact would not be mitigated to any meaningful degree by the set back from the boundary.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, contrary to LPR Policy CP1 which seeks to ensure that proposals do not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the general amenities of nearby occupiers.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that whilst the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the street scene, it would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property. For these reasons it would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework in particular paragraphs 127 which, amongst other things, seeks the creation of high quality places and buildings, sympathetic to the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR