



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

**by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19 November 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3283157**

**4 Willow Close, Hutton CM13 2NT**

- 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 Ms Lucy Mecklenburgh against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00940/HHA, dated 24 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is erection of roof extensions and porch.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

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

## Reasons

3. The site includes a residential dwelling within a cul-de-sac that is characterised by bungalows of varying designs, including some with a contemporary appearance. The dwelling on site and several of the neighbouring properties feature first floor accommodation. However, those properties mostly feature rooflights and not dormers in their front roof slopes.
4. The proposed development includes a first floor extension that would protrude over single storey pitched and hipped projections to the front of the dwelling, a ground floor front extension that would be used as a porch, and extensions of a hip-to-gable style to the dwelling's sides.
5. The proposal would retain the symmetrical and contemporary appearance of the dwelling. However, the first floor front extension would be a relatively large, partly flat roofed addition that would span across a significant proportion of the dwelling and have irregularly shaped windows to accommodate the porch roof. Consequently, the first floor extension would sit awkwardly above the single storey projections and the porch and the resulting front elevation would appear cramped. There are no comparable front extensions nearby. For these reasons, the front extensions would make the dwelling appear incongruent in the cul-de-sac. The character and appearance of the area would be harmed as a result.
6. Sufficient space would be provided between the hip-to-gable style extensions and the neighbouring properties. In addition, the small hipped elements of

these extensions, which the Council describes as being of 'barn hip design', would be reflective of roof features evident at properties within and at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. However, the harm arising from the front extensions would nevertheless remain.

7. Whilst Class AA of Part 1, Schedule 2 of the GPDO<sup>1</sup> provides for the enlargement of a dwelling by construction of additional storeys, the appellant sets out that the proposal cannot be constructed by means of the provisions of Class AA. Furthermore, I cannot be certain as to whether alterations will be made to other properties in the cul-de-sac, or what effect potential future development nearby would have on the character and appearance of the area. I do not consider that the existence of Class AA or any other provisions of the GPDO indicate that the harm identified is justified.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it conflicts with Policy CP1 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan, which requires that development does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character and appearance of its surroundings. It is also contrary to Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide, which encourage development to be sympathetic of and influenced by local context.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons set out above the appeal should be dismissed.

*Mark Philpott*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015