



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: 25 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3282130

22 Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch CM15 9RA

- 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 Clive Bellamy against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01025/HHA, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of double storey side extension with car port on the ground floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of double storey side extension with car port on the ground floor at 22 Crow Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch CM15 9RA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01025/HHA, dated 9 April 2021, 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: PL-5912_11; PL-5912_12A; PL-5912_13; PL-5912_14A; PL-5912_15; PL-5912_16.
 - 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 dwellinghouse.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the formal decision is taken from the planning application form as it accurately describes the proposed development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site includes a 2 storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on Crow Green Road that forms part of a group of similar houses from Nos 14 to 24 (evens). The road is otherwise characterised by bungalows and houses of diverse ages and styles. However, several properties include side projections and gaps between some dwellings are narrow. Notably, Nos 16 and 18 include 2 storey side projections that are set back from their front walls with a small gap between

them. Additionally, a 2 storey side projection at No 20 extends near to the site's boundary.

5. The proposed extension would project close to the boundary with No 20. However, the resulting gap would not be dissimilar to the one between the side projections at Nos 16 and 18. Furthermore, the extension would be set back from the road to a comparable extent to the side projections at Nos 16 to 20. Consequently, the extension would only be apparent when positioned to the front of the site and No 20, and from such positions a gap between the properties would be clearly visible. Longer distance oblique views of the extension would be limited due to the positions of the existing buildings. Therefore, the proposal would not result in a harmful terracing effect. As such, the development would be compatible with the character and appearance of the group of houses and the wider area.
6. The Council sets out that the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (LP) provides guidance which states that upper storey extensions should not be erected any closer than one metre to boundaries. However, no development plan policies have been referred to which specifically require this. Furthermore, development elsewhere in the vicinity is within one metre of the side boundaries of properties. Based on the evidence before me, the one metre gap to boundaries is guidance and not a policy requirement. In the circumstances of this case and for the reasons identified, the gap between Nos 20 and 22 would be sufficient to avoid harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. A condition to require that the materials used in the construction of the development match the existing dwelling is necessary as this would ensure that the resulting property is compatible with the area's character and has a cohesive appearance.
8. I therefore find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it accords with Policy CP1 of the LP, which requires that development does not have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character and appearance of its surroundings. It also accords with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, amongst other things, sets out that development should be sympathetic to local character.
9. In addition to the materials condition, the standard time condition and one to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans are required in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR