



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11TH July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/24/3340668

88 Wainwright Avenue, Hutton, Essex, CM13 2SZ.

- 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 Shane Batterbee against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01289/HHA, dated 12 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and chimney, proposed two storey extension, single storey rear extension including roof lantern.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property, 88 Wainwright Avenue is the end property in a short terrace of four, two-storey, hipped roofed houses.
4. The appellant proposes the demolition of the existing conservatory and chimney and the construction of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension. The proposed extensions would be built up to the common boundary with number 90 Wainwright Avenue, at both single and two-storey level. The flank walls of the two extensions would be angled to follow the existing boundary line.
5. As I saw the properties in Wainwright Avenue are generally well spaced with often sufficient room for parking or garage access between neighbouring houses. The proposed two-storey extension would completely fill the gap to the common boundary to number 90. This would cause significant harm to the spatial quality, visual amenity and thereby the character and appearance of the area.
6. In addition, the ridge and eaves line of the side extension would be set down from those of the main roof and the two-storey extension. Due to the set down in the eaves line, the gable roof design and the splayed gable end wall the two-storey addition would detract from the three dimensional form and

architectural integrity of the design of the host property and the terrace of four houses of which it is part. Accordingly, by reason of its design the two-storey extension would appear as an unattractive, utilitarian incongruous addition.

7. For the foregoing reason I conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the aims of Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 (Adopted March 2022) and the National Planning Policy Framework as they relate to, along with other things, the quality of development and the need for development to respond positively and sympathetically to its context.
8. In reaching my conclusion I have been mindful that the extensions would be constructed from the same pallet of materials as the existing house, its street elevation would be set back behind that of the main façade of the dwelling and that a hedge and some planting could be retained around the front garden and parking area. However, these considerations do not, in this case outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred me to a number of similar two storey extensions in Brentwood. Whatever the background to those cases, their existence is not an appropriate justification for permitting another, which in any case I have considered on its individual planning merits.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR