



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/20/3263117

4 Clavering Way, Hutton, Brentwood, Essex CM13 1YT

- 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 Simon White against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00763/HHA, dated 8 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a 2 storey side extension at 4 Clavering Way, Hutton, Brentwood, Essex CM13 1YT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/00763/HHA, dated 8 June 2020 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2020.313.01 Rev B 2020.313.02, 2020.313.03, 2020.313.04 Rev A, 2020.313.05 Rev B and 2020.313.06.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) No development above ground level shall take place until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the location, species and size of all new trees, shrubs and hedgerows to be planted or transplanted and shall be completed during the first planting season after the date on which any part of the development is commenced or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any newly planted tree, shrub or hedgerow that dies, or is uprooted, severely damaged or seriously diseased within five years of the completion of the development, shall be replaced within the next planting season with another of the same species and of a similar size.

Procedural Matters

2. During the determination of the planning application, amended plans were submitted to the Council. Notwithstanding those listed on the decision notice,

the Council has confirmed the drawing numbers that it considered the proposal with reference to, and I have determined the appeal on the same basis.

3. The decision notice also provides a revised description of development from that given on the planning application form. This includes additional detail of features of the development, but these aspects are illustrated on the plans and I see no need for specific reference to them within the description. Moreover, while the appellant has used the revised description on the appeal form, neither party has provided written confirmation that the change was agreed. I consider the original description given on the application form to adequately set out what is proposed, and I have therefore used it in my formal decision above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The area surrounding the appeal site is generally characterised by detached dwellings of similar general appearance as a result of the fairly restricted palette of external materials and common detailing. This provides for an attractive sense of cohesion overall. Nevertheless, individual buildings vary in their form and scale providing for some diversity and visual interest to the area, and this is further reinforced by the irregular layout of many of the dwellings around cul-de-sacs.
6. The appeal proposes an extension to the side of the dwelling where there is currently a single-storey garage projection, and would result in an increase in the width and overall scale and mass of the dwelling which is already one of the widest in the area, particularly at the upper level.
7. However, I am satisfied that there would be sufficient difference in the width of the extension in comparison to that of the host dwelling that it would be noticeably smaller. The main front elevation of the extension would also be set back from the adjacent part of the dwelling with the unenclosed front canopy element adding little to the overall appearance of scale, and it would be of lesser depth to the rear at first-floor level. Moreover, the ridge and eaves levels of the extension roof would be set down appreciably against those of the host building. These factors in combination would both break up the mass and visual bulk of the development on the site, and would in my view result in the extension appearing plainly subordinate to the appeal property.
8. The extension would remain set in from the widest part of the appeal site, and there would be significant spacing around the building. The differing orientations of dwellings at 1-3 Clavering Way and the position of 5 Clavering Way beyond the appeal site would additionally minimise opportunities to view the width of the appeal dwelling in direct comparison to these neighbours, moderating any visual impact. Given also the context of the varied layout and form of individual buildings nearby, I do not find that the scale of the appeal dwelling would be striking or incompatible with its surroundings. While I acknowledge that the development would be clearly visible, including in views along Clavering Way, it would not therefore appear inappropriate or dominant and I am satisfied that it would be a sympathetic addition.

9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area and I find no conflict with saved Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005. Amongst other things, this policy requires a high standard of design which is compatible with existing buildings and that the visual amenity, character and appearance of an area are not detrimentally impacted. I also find no conflict with requirements for well-designed places within the National Planning Policy Framework, or advice within the National Design Guide seeking development that responds positively to its context.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of certainty. Given the nature of the vegetation on the appeal site including the laurel hedging which is shown to be removed, and that the proposal does not suggest additional hard surfacing or changes to ground levels, I am not persuaded that the Council's suggested condition to require a scheme of hard and soft landscaping prior to development would be necessary. I have however imposed conditions to require details of the suggested new planting, as well as the use of materials to match the existing building, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. Subject to these conditions and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Bowyer
INSPECTOR