
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022 by Emma Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3286244

96 Woodman Road, Warley CM14 5AZ

- 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 James Dayton against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01098/HHA, dated 17 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable loft conversion, addition of a rear dormer, addition of roof light(s) to front and alterations to chimney stacks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling within a residential location. The dwelling currently has a hipped roof with a Victorian style two-storey bay window with a gable roof on the front elevation. The proposed development would replace the hipped roof with a gable roof form and would introduce a box dormer to the rear and roof lights to the front, to facilitate a loft conversion. It also includes the replacement of the two existing chimney stacks with one larger chimney.
5. The Council raises no objection to the proposed hip to gable roof extension or the proposed rooflights on the front elevation and I find no reason to disagree with this. Therefore, the following assessment will solely focus on the proposed rear dormer and replacement chimney.
6. The proposed dormer would cover the majority of the roof space to the rear of the dwelling, with a height similar to the ridge height of the main dwelling and the width extending the full width of the property. This substantial size would result in a bulky and overly large addition to the rear of the property which would not be subservient in appearance to the host dwelling. Although this

would only be partially visible from the streetscene, it would nevertheless be visible from the surrounding dwellings and therefore would still have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. As well as its excessive size, the proposed dormer would possess a significant level of glazing, including a Juliette balcony. This window would be much larger than the traditional fenestration of the host dwelling, drawing attention to the top-heavy appearance and further adding to the dominant nature of the dormer. Although the contemporary design and materials, such as the metal clad rim, may add design interest to the proposed dormer, they would contribute to its discordant nature when compared to the traditional appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding properties.
8. The appellant's comments, that the chimney pots were excluded from the plans in error, are noted. A larger chimney on the appeal property, with chimney pots, would be more in keeping with others on the host terrace and within the surrounding area than the existing chimney stacks. Therefore, this part of the proposal would not be a harmful addition to the property.
9. However, for the reasons above, I conclude that the proposed rear dormer would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would therefore be contrary to Policies CP1 and H17 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (2005). These policies seek to ensure that proposed development does not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, with the design and scale of a dormer window remaining a subsidiary feature. It would also conflict with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide.

Other Matters

10. A lawful development certificate has been granted for a rear dormer on the appeal property which is similar to the proposal before me, and I give this substantial weight as a fallback position. However, the proposed dormer and subsequent fenestration is larger than what is allowed under permitted development rights and therefore has a greater impact upon the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the lesser scale of the fallback position would be preferable and does not justify an acceptance of the harm identified from the appeal scheme.
11. The appellant has highlighted a number of similar dormer windows in the surrounding area including one on the same terrace as the appeal proposal. However, it is stated that many of these have been constructed under permitted development rights and although these do contribute to the character and appearance of the area, they are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal before me which requires planning permission due to its size.
12. It is noted that no objections have been received regarding the proposal development. However, this is a neutral factor which would not overcome the harm found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Emma Grierson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR