



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by **Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/25/3366386

68 Avenue Road, Ingatestone, Essex CM4 9HB

- 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 Sally Atkinson against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01391/HHA.
 - The development proposed is described as the following: Demolition of existing side garage and rear conservatory and construct part two storey front, side and rear extensions and part single storey front extension and rear extensions, alterations to fenestration. Add solar panels and apply render to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a dwelling on one side of a short cul-de-sac on Avenue Road. The wider area is that of twentieth century suburban housing of a somewhat varied but broadly comparable scale, density, plot size and general character. Within this wider context, No 68 is situated between two square plan gable ended houses of more or less the same scale and design, separated from each other by their attached flat roof side garages.
4. The proposals involve removing the flat roofed garage to one side of No 68 and extending the width of the main part of the existing house. Bringing its gable end almost up to the side boundary with the neighbouring house at No 70, would remove the degree of separation visible above the flat-roofed garage. Whilst maintaining the same ridge and eaves height, the main part of the dwelling would extend to most of the width of the plot, leaving only the existing narrow gap up to the boundary with No 66, adjacent to its attached flat roofed side garage.
5. The widened main house would then be extended further at both the front and rear. To the front there would be two-storey gabled extensions coming forward at each end, with a central single storey, lean-to in between these. To the rear, the projecting part of the flat roofed garage and a conservatory would be replaced by a single storey extension filling the corner gap between the widened main house and a further two-storey gabled extension.

6. No 68 is set slightly further back than the similar houses to each side, and the front extensions would come no further than the building line these neighbouring properties establish. Despite this, this proposal to extend on three sides, mainly at two storeys, would completely absorb and overwhelm the existing house and create a much larger built plan and massing. Whilst the gabled fronted extensions provide a degree of articulation to this increased mass, the end result would be a dwelling of significant bulk, with very wide, ungainly side elevations, particularly to the side with two storey extensions front and rear. Whilst there would be reasonably balanced fenestration applied to this enlarged dwelling, it would nevertheless appear incongruously large and bulky, harmfully out of keeping with the dwellings it currently matches on either side. The altered facing materials would contribute further to the anomalous appearance of the larger dwelling proposed.
7. The fact that other dwellings in the surrounding area might have been the subject of varying degrees of enlargement and alteration, provides no reasonable mitigation for the harm that would result from these proposals. The development would result in no built heritage or natural environment harm, but this does not obviate the need to consider the effects on the character and appearance of the surroundings. The house is not in a particularly inconspicuous location. Even if considered not unduly prominent, this gives no reasonable leeway for an unsatisfactory design. As it is, the dwelling is part of an unremarkable but nonetheless quite pleasant street scene. The significant degree of enlargement proposed would detract from the openness of this, where the much larger dwelling would appear incongruous by disrupting the present built rhythm and creating an over-dominant appearance.
8. There might be no objection in principle to some enlargement to this dwelling, provided this appeared as a suitable evolution of its present visual character and this blended in satisfactorily with its built surroundings. However, as proposed, the scale, bulk, materials and design would engulf the existing dwelling, creating one that would appear harmfully out of character with its surroundings. This would be contrary to Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Ingatestone and Fryerning Neighbourhood Plan, both of which seek to ensure a high standard of design. These policies reflect the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which attach great importance to the design of the built environment as a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would result in a larger dwelling that would be out of keeping with its surroundings, having a significantly adverse effect upon the character and appearance of this residential area, in conflict with the Local and Neighbourhood Plan when read as a whole. Therefore, I conclude the appeal should not succeed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR