



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/25/3365642

11 Honeypot Lane, Brentwood, Essex CM14 4QT

- 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 Ms Dee Sargeant against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01369/HHA.
 - The development proposed is described as: Proposed roof-space conversion including raising ridge and eaves of existing roof structure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Proposed roof-space conversion including raising ridge and eaves of existing roof structure at 11 Honeypot Lane, Brentwood, CM14 4QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01369/HHA, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: DS.DJA.3, DS.DJA.4A, DS.DJA.5A, DS.DJA.7A, DS.DJA.8A, DS.DJA.9A, DS.DJA.10A, DS.DJA.11 and Location Plan.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect on the character and appearance of the local area.
 - The personal circumstances of a family member and the need for the proposed development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is a two storey detached dwelling with a hipped roof, which is in keeping with this part of the street scene. The proposal is seeking to raise the ridge by approximately 90cm to create a room in the roof space. I noted during my site visit that one of the adjacent residential properties has had dormers installed on the front and rear elevation, which extend above the ridge height and 21 Honeypot Lane is a two and a half storey dwelling with a similar design to the appeal proposal. It is also likely from the submitted evidence that the dormers on the

adjacent property are recent and potentially post decision by the Council. However, the Council has had chance to comment on the submitted evidence and has chosen not to.

4. The raising of the ridge height and the substantial change in the front elevation is not considered to be of high quality design and would detract from the overall consistency of this section of street scene, which the site and the majority of its immediate neighbours form. This is tempered given the design of the front dormers to the adjacent property and the design of No.21. However, the design by raising the ridge height is not considered to preserve the overall character and appearance of the local area.
5. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the local area. On this basis the proposal does not comply with Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan 2022 that seeks high quality design, which responds positively and sympathetically to the local area. This requirement is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Personal circumstance

6. Decision makers are required by the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) set out in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 to have due regard to advancing equality of opportunity and to eliminate unlawful discrimination in relation to, amongst others, people with disabilities.
7. The proposal is to provide more appropriate and long term residential accommodation for a family member with a disability within the family home. I accept that the current room the family member is using as a bedroom is not of suitable size for their long term needs, specifically if equipment is required in the future.
8. The Council has considered in its Delegated Report that there are potential other design options that could be used to accommodate the family member's needs. While there are likely other ways to reconfigure the existing dwelling and provide suitable extensions that would have noticeably less impact on the street scene, as detailed above the overall harm is mitigated by the design reflecting other development in the local area. In conclusion, in this specific case the needs of the appellant's family member weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.

Conditions

9. The recommended conditions by the Council are agreed with, as these are required to ensure the development is commenced in a reasonable timeframe and in accordance with the submitted drawings. In addition, a condition requiring materials to match those of the existing dwelling is considered necessary to ensure the impact of the development is reduced.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

10. In favour of the appeal, the proposal would provide suitable long term residential accommodation for a family member with a disability. I attach significant weight to this consideration. While the proposal is not considered to be of high quality design, it would have similar design principles to a small number of dwellings in the locality and on this basis the harm to the character and appearance of the local area is not significant.

11. Based on my considerations of the main issues highlighted above, I find that the need of the family member with a disability does outweigh the harm that would be caused. Material considerations therefore do indicate that permission should be granted for development that is not in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be allowed.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR