
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: 10 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3269288
98 Worrin Road, Shenfield, CM15 8JL

- 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 Robert Waddell against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01447/HHA, dated 6 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing part single and part two-storey rear extensions and erection of part single storey and part two-storey side and rear extensions; extension of roof over front porch; conversion of loft to habitable space with rear facing Juliette balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing part single and part two-storey rear extensions and erection of part single storey and part two-storey side and rear extensions; extension of roof over front porch; conversion of loft to habitable space with rear facing Juliette balcony at 98 Worrin Road, Shenfield, CM15 8JL, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01447/HHA, dated 6 October 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 20-0277 D01A, 20-0277 D02, 20-0277 D03, 20-0277 D04A, 20-0277 D05A and 20-0277 D06A.
 - 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 detached house with a large rear garden in a residential area comprised of similarly large detached houses on large plots of land, albeit of varied design and appearance.

4. The council has not raised any concerns or objections relating to the alterations proposed to the front of the property surrounding the main entrance door, to the proposed parapet walls and pitched roofs above the existing single storey flat roof extensions to either side of the house or to the conversion of the roof space and installation of roof lights. I have no reason to disagree with this view and I note from the planning history set out in the council's delegated report that many of the proposed changes have previously been approved.
5. The reason for refusal relates principally to the roof form of the proposed rear extension. I observed from the rear garden of the property and from viewing the surrounding area that a significant variety of roof forms and roof extensions exist, particularly to the rear of the dwellings in the area. To the rear of adjacent 100 Worrin Road, there is a large flat roof dormer with a Juliette balcony and adjacent 96 Worrin Road has a large gable ended roof to the rear. Further afield I saw twin roof hipped and gable projections to the rear of some houses on prominent corner plots and I also noted that at No. 39 Worrin Road there was a rear extension with a Gambrel roof similar to that proposed here.
6. I was unable to see the rear of the host dwelling from Worrin Road or Combe Rise. The proposed rear extension would project no further beyond the original wall of the dwelling than the existing extensions. Although the Gambrel roof is less common in this area than other roof forms, it would be set in and set down from the original roof line of the host dwelling, the shallow pitch of the upper part of the roof would not be visually prominent. The limited views of the proposed roof from the street would appear little different to what would be seen should the design be amended to a twin roof extension with a valley as suggested by the council. The twin roof and valley would only be visible from within the rear garden of the appeal site and immediate neighbouring gardens. From the street all that would be visible would be partial views of a sloping roof. Whilst a hipped finish would be less prominent and more in keeping with the existing dwelling, given the wide variety of roof forms in the area and the limited views of the rear of the site, an alternative design solution would not be harmful in this particular case.
7. Consequently, I do not agree that the proposal would result in any dominant or negative impact on the street scene or that it would detract from the existing spatial qualities of the visible roofscape.
8. 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.

Conditions

9. 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. The proposed first floor windows in the side elevations would be to bathrooms, which are non-habitable rooms and generally have obscure glazing for privacy. A condition requiring these windows to be obscure glazed and non-

opening below 1.7m is unnecessary given the nature of these rooms and the presence of existing side windows in the house.

Conclusion

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

Rachael Bartlett

INSPECTOR