



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 January 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/24/3354272

Little Oaks, Fingrith Hall Road, Blackmore, Ingatestone, Essex CM4 0RU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Barry Lodge against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00769/HHA.
 - The development proposed is alterations and additions to existing ground floor and loft rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of Fingrith Hall Lane, a residential street with a mix of housing types including chalet style dwellings and two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings.
5. The appeal dwelling and its neighbouring property to the north, 'Pyrgo', are link-detached chalet style dwellings adjoined by their respective single garages which extend off the flank elevations. Both properties have flat roofed front dormers and are of a similar design and scale, such that they are viewed as a pair. On the other side of the appeal site there are another two link-detached chalet style dwellings of slightly different design, with hipped front dormer windows, which are also viewed as a pair.
6. The 'pairing' of these dwellings gives them a distinctive appearance and a degree of symmetry despite small design differences, and they are an attractive feature of the street. Therefore, although other dwellings in the street are of different designs, the appeal site with 'Pyrgo' and the neighbouring pair make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area.

7. The submitted plans show that the proposed development would raise the ridge height of the appeal dwelling and increase the size and scale of the roof relative to the rest of the dwelling. This would markedly change the proportions of the dwelling, making it appear unbalanced and top-heavy compared to both the existing dwelling and to the front elevation of 'Pyrgo'.
8. The appellant has submitted a street view drawing which shows the existing and proposed front elevation of the appeal dwelling and 'Pyrgo'. This indicates that the ground level slopes down from 'Pyrgo' to Little Oaks, such that the roofline and windows of the appeal dwelling appear to sit at a lower level than those of 'Pyrgo'.
9. However, it appears that there are inaccuracies in this drawing compared to what I saw on site, for example in the positioning and height of the eaves relative to the windows. Furthermore, from visiting the site, there appears to be no discernible change in ground level between the appeal dwelling and 'Pyrgo', so these properties have a similar roof ridge height rather than the stepped ridges shown on the street view drawing. This indicates that the submitted drawing does not provide an accurate representation of existing conditions on site. Therefore, it does not provide a reliable indication of the 'proposed street view' and I have not relied upon this drawing in making my recommendation.
10. Consequently, the proposed alterations to the roof would make the appeal dwelling appear materially taller than both 'Pyrgo' and the pair of chalet style dwellings to the south of the appeal site. Changing the size and proportions of this dwelling in the pair, in between dwellings of otherwise similar scale, would introduce a dominant and incongruous form within the street scene.
11. Although found on the neighbouring pair, the proposed hipped roof front dormer windows would further change the appearance of the appeal dwelling. Combined with the increase in roof size and ridge height and the addition of a front porch, this front dormer design would make the front elevation of the appeal property look significantly different to that of 'Pyrgo'. Their existing degree of symmetry would be much altered, such that they could no longer be viewed as a pair, diminishing their contribution to the street scene and harming the character and appearance of the local area.
12. The appellant has referred to a nearby property 'Pedlars Mead', which appears to have a similar design to what is proposed for the appeal dwelling, albeit on a slightly larger scale. It is however a detached dwelling, not part of a linked pair, so is seen in a different context to the appeal dwelling and does not have a comparable visual impact.
13. The appellant suggests that, once completed, the proposed development would have a similar appearance to the pair of dwellings on the other side of the appeal site. However, this pair has a sense of symmetry from their similar roof heights and hipped front dormer windows, whereas the proposal would result in an unbalanced appearance across its pair. Therefore, these other dwellings do not have a comparable impact to the appeal proposal.
14. Accordingly, for the reasons set out above, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and local area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan 2016-2033 which requires proposals to meet high design standards and respond positively and sympathetically to their context.

Other Matters

15. The lack of objection from neighbours is a neutral matter and does not override any of the considerations referred to in my recommendation. There is, however, an objection to the proposed development from the parish council which I have taken into consideration.
16. The appellant argues that 'Pyrgo' has a large rear loft extension which imposes on the appeal dwelling. However, this does not have a significant impact in the street scene or on the appearance of the pair and therefore does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area that the appeal proposal would cause.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR