



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/24/3338153

116 London Road, Brentwood, Essex, CM14 4NS.

- 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 Duggan against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council
 - The application Ref 23/01099/HHA, dated 5 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension, new pitched roof, porch and front gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension, new pitched roof and front gates.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted insofar as it relates to the porch at 116 London Road, Brentwood, Essex, CM14 4NS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01099/HHA, dated 5 September 2023, and the plans submitted with it (so far as they are relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted) and 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, drawings: 22-046-PP-01/Rev 02 and 22-045-PP-02/Rev04.
 - 4) Prior to the construction of the porch shown on drawing 22-0456-PP-02/04, details of a sustainable drainage feature to be incorporated into this element of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

3. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property, the group of dwellings and thereby the character of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 116 London Road, is a detached two-storey dwelling with bedroom accommodation in the roof space. It has an attached single storey garage and an earlier single storey rear addition.
5. The road, which falls west to east, is characterised here by a mix of detached and semi-detached vernacular styled dwellings. Generally, the main roofs are designed with full hips thereby maintaining a visual gap between neighbouring dwellings at roof level.
6. The appellant proposes the demolition of the garage and the construction of two-storey side addition together with a single storey extension of the existing rear addition. The existing hipped roof and box dormer is to be replaced with a new raised gable roof with small hips. The new roof would incorporate a rear facing box dormer along with roof lights in the front roof slope. It is also proposed to replace the existing porch and add a new front wall and gates.
7. Due to the topography of the road an increase in ridge height would be acceptable here. However, as the flank wall of the two-storey side extension would be built right up to the common boundaries of numbers 114 and 118 it would significantly diminish the gap to those neighbouring properties. Further, due to the three-dimension form of the roof, built across the full width of the house as extended it would appear as a large, bulky building and thereby somewhat utilitarian in appearance.
8. For the foregoing reasons the two-storey side extension would not reflect the character and architectural style of the either the host dwelling or the neighbouring properties. It would therefore cause significant harm to the architectural integrity of the host property and thereby the character of the area.
9. The proposed front boundary wall would be about 1.8 metres high with 2.0 metre high brick pillars to either side of the entrance gates. The gates would be set back about 3.0 metres. As I observed the front boundary treatment in the area is generally low level and softened by planting. On balance therefore I consider that a high wall with solid timber gates would not be in keeping. It would cause further harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I conclude in respect of the main issue that while the proposed porch would be acceptable. However, the two-storey extension, alterations to the roof, along with the high boundary wall and gates would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property, the group of properties and thereby the character and appearance of the area. To allow the proposal would therefore be contrary to the objectives of Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 (Adopted March 2022), the National Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework as they seek to promote, along with other things, high-quality design and reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other Considerations

11. The proposed porch, that Council found acceptable, would by reason of its pitched roof enhance the appearance of the house and thereby the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. This element is not an integral part of the overall development and therefore I will allow the appeal insofar as it relates to the porch.

Conditions

12. The conditions follow from those suggested by the Council. To ensure a high-quality development, I shall include a condition about the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building. In order to reduce the potential for off site flooding in what is identified by the Council to be a critical drainage area I shall require rainwater from the porch to discharge to a sustainable drainage feature.
13. In the interests of certainty, I shall impose a condition requiring the development to be undertaken in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed only in part but otherwise dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR