



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2021

by R Bartlett PGDIP URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3269133

79 Cornwall Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 9LU

- 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 Jason Court against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01776/HHA, dated 1 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 79 Cornwall Road, Pilgrims Hatch, Brentwood, Essex, CM15 9LU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01776/HHA, dated 1 December 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: Drawing Numbers 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07 and 08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site comprises a two-storey end of terrace house located on a prominent corner plot. To the east, south and west there are similar rows of two-storey terraced houses in blocks of varying lengths and dwelling numbers. To the north of the site there are two-storey semi-detached houses with long rear gardens.
4. It is proposed to extend the dwelling to the side. The eaves, ridge and principal elevation would match that of the existing terrace appearing as a natural extension to it and retaining the gable end. To my mind setting the front wall back and the ridge height down would detract from the overall

appearance of the terraced block. The extension would project 2.8m beyond the rear wall of the terrace and this part of the proposal would have a hipped roof, the ridge height of which would be well below that of the host dwelling. The external materials of the extension would match those of the existing terraced block of houses.

5. During my site visit I observed a number of similar two-storey side and rear extensions, including on corner plots such as this one. Standing to the front of the dwelling, at the junction of Cornwall Road and Gloucester Road, I was able to see that both dwellings on the Junction of Gloucester Road have two-storey side extensions close to the boundary, one of which also projects to the rear. Likewise, I could see a two-storey side extension with rear projections on the corner of Stuart Close and Cornwall Road, close to the boundary and the end terraced house on the opposite side of Gloucester Road to the appeal site has a substantial two-storey side extension and a single storey garage extension to the side.
6. The proposed extension would be 1m from the site boundary at its closest point but due to the shape of the site would be approximately 1.8m from the boundary at the rear. The site also benefits from the presence of a grass verge between its boundary fence and the footway, which would ensure the spatial quality of the area that the council were concerned about, is retained. Accordingly, despite being on a prominent corner plot, the extension would not appear unduly dominant or incompatible with its surroundings.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be in accordance with policy CP1 (i) and (iii) of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (2005), which is supportive of development proposals that are of a high standard of design and would not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I also find no conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. For clarity, I have imposed conditions setting out the time limit within which the development must commence and the approved drawing numbers. A condition to ensure that the materials match those of the existing dwelling is also necessary in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR