



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2022

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/21/3288529

3A Roman Road, Ingatestone, Essex CM4 9AA

- 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 John Woodhouse against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01457/HHA, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is side and rear single storey (ground floor) extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for side and rear single storey (ground floor) extension at 3A Roman Road, Ingatestone, Essex CM4 9AA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01457/HHA, dated 17 August 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 approved plans listed below:

Site Location Plan

Existing & Proposed Floor Plans - JW.DJA.1A

Proposed Elevations - JW.DJA.2A
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall not commence above slab level until details of the bricks and roof tiles to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Preliminary Matters

2. There is disagreement between the main parties as to what constitutes the 'front' or principal elevation of the property. Although I have used the description of development stated on the planning application forms in the heading to this appeal, I do not make any definitive judgements with regard to what constitutes the property's 'front' or principal elevation.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an existing detached bungalow, finished in brick with brown roof tiles. Properties within the vicinity of the appeal site are a mix of two storey dwellings and bungalows. Although properties are of varying styles and appearances the predominant finishes are of either brick or render with brown roof tiles. The appeal property is therefore broadly reflective of the character of the area.
5. The appeal property occupies a corner position. However, by virtue of being a single storey building positioned close to a two storey dwelling and by being at a slightly lower ground level than the adjacent public footpath, it does not appear particularly prominent within the street scene.
6. From my site visit it was apparent that the main door to the property is on the elevation fronting The Leas. The work the appellant has undertaken in creating a crossover to this side of the property will make this more evident. The proposed extension to the lounge/dining area will bring the building closer to the boundary with The Leas and further increase the prominence of this elevation.
7. However, the building already sits forward of any notional building line established by properties further along The Leas. This does not currently cause any undue harm to the street scene. I am satisfied that the degree of separation between the appeal property and those dwellings further along The Leas ensures that the extended building would similarly not be disruptive in that regard.
8. In addition to the extension coming closer to the boundary with The Leas, the ridge of the proposed roof would match that of the main bungalow. This would add to the extension's size and prominence. In this respect the extension would not appear entirely subservient, particularly when viewed from Roman Road. However, its hipped design and pitch would reflect that of the existing building and it would be hipped back into the site and away from the site's boundaries. Furthermore, the proposed areas of render within the extension and to the existing elevations will further assist in integrating the extension into the building as a whole.
9. Overall, its design and appearance would not be disproportionate or harmful to the building's general appearance. I accept that these works would give the building a greater prominence in the street scene when compared to the existing situation. However, the extension would be set back from the junction of The Leas and Roman Road, and I do not find that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area.
10. The proposed rear extension to the kitchen would be a modest single storey addition set close to the site's eastern boundary. The Council has not objected to this element of the scheme. Based on the evidence before me, including my own observations, I find no reason to conclude otherwise.
11. I have found that the proposal as a whole would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would accord with Policy CP1 of the Local Plan which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure developments do not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of their surrounding area.

Other Matters

12. I note that interested parties raised concerns regarding the new vehicular access arrangements for the property and its proximity to the junction with The Leas. However, these matters do not form part of the proposal which is before me and so the merits of the access are outside the remit of this appeal.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition is required in the interests of certainty that lists the approved plans. Given that the existing building utilises a number of different colours of brick, a condition requiring the brick and roof tile details to be agreed with the Council is also necessary to ensure that the extension integrates with the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR