



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: 13th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3283552

90 Long Ridings Avenue, Hutton CM13 1EG

- 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 and Ms Jordan and Jessica Barbier and Sena against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01167/HHA, dated 1 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey front and rear extensions and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The site relates to a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Long Ridings Avenue and Woodland Avenue. The dwelling is set back from Woodland Avenue, with a garden enclosed by fencing to its side. A footway and grass verge are also located between the dwelling and the highway. The site tapers such that it becomes narrower towards its rear.
4. The area is characterised by similar semi-detached properties; however, other types of housing are also evident. In particular, there is a high number of bungalows in the immediate vicinity. There are many bungalows on both sides of Woodland Avenue, including in a row to the rear of the site. Additionally, a tree belt is visible behind bungalows on one side of the highway. Although both Long Ridings Avenue and Woodland Avenue have alignments that are partly curved, the buildings along them tend to be set back from the highway. The positions of the buildings, the number of bungalows near the site and the tree belt provide the immediate area with a sense of spaciousness. The space to the side of the dwelling on site contributes to this characteristic positively.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would protrude significantly beyond the front walls of the bungalows to the rear of the site. The extension would be highly visible from the junction and along Woodland Avenue. It would substantially reduce the space to the side of the dwelling and project close to the highway, particularly towards its rear. Consequently, the extension would

- be prominent, intrusive and cramped, and the sense of spaciousness to the side of the dwelling would be eroded.
6. Both the Council and the appellant have referred to previously refused schemes for the erection of a dwelling on site. However, the considerations for new housing are not directly comparable to those for extensions and thus those schemes have little relevance to this appeal.
 7. Extensions have been made to housing in the area and I have been referred to several. A two storey extension is evident at 99 Long Ridings Avenue, but it is narrower and further from the Woodland Avenue highway than, and thus is not directly comparable with, the proposed one. The appellant has provided a drawing showing that the proposed extension would be nearly in line with the extension at No 99 when viewed from Woodland Avenue to the rear of the site, and that the distance between the proposal and the dwelling at 79 Woodland Avenue would be similar to the gap between the dwellings at No 99 and 75 Woodland Avenue. However, the gap between the proposal and the dwelling at 81 Woodland Avenue would be narrower, and the spaciousness beside the existing dwelling would nonetheless be eroded for the reasons identified.
 8. The side wall of development at 125 Whittington Road projects close to Woodland Avenue. In that respect it is similar to the proposal. However, No 125 is an end of terrace property some distance from the site and bungalows are not prevalent in its immediate vicinity. The immediate context and character of its surroundings are not the same as for the proposal and thus it is not directly comparable either. Other properties are referenced in Long Ridings Avenue, Woodland Avenue and Storr Gardens; however, they are also not directly comparable as they do not have the same relationship to the highway as the proposal has to Woodland Avenue or have equivalent immediate contexts.
 9. In any event, full details of the development referred to or the circumstances that led to the construction of those schemes have not been provided. I must determine the appeal based on its merits and the evidence before me. Whilst other elements of the scheme would not be harmful, for the above reasons, the side extension would harm the character and appearance of the area.
 10. Therefore, the proposal 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.

Other Matters

11. I note that the proposal aims to create a family dwelling that is desirable for the appellants and that alterations were made to the application as originally submitted to address some of the Council's concerns. I also acknowledge that no objections have been received from local residents. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm identified or the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR