
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: 21st August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/W/25/3364529

67 Westwood Avenue, Brentwood, Essex CM14 4NU

- 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 and Mrs Clear against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00083/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Demolition of existing front projection to property and garage. Proposed double storey new build to side of property with single storey rear extensions, allocated parking and bin store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development appears to have been agreed by both parties. On this basis I have used the revised description, as detailed on the Decision Notice.
3. During the appeal a signed Unilateral Undertaking was provided by the appellant ensuring the proposal is a self build dwelling. On this basis the development is exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the:
 - effect on the character and appearance of the local area.
 - provision of parking for the donor dwelling.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The donor dwelling of 67 Westwood Avenue (No.67) forms half of two semi-detached properties, though it is noted the attached neighbouring dwelling (No.65) is linked to a bungalow via a single storey garage. An area of hard landscaping forms part of the existing driveway of No.67, that separates the dwelling from another pair of semi-detached dwellings (No.69 and 71). The street scene is characterised by a mixture of detached and semi-detached properties in a variety of traditional styles. The material palette of the street scene is made up of predominantly bricks and render.
6. The proposed dwelling would have a similar design to that of No.67, though its front elevation is slightly set back from No.67. With the proposal being a new

dwelling, rather than an extension it is not a necessary requirement that the development is subservient. The proposed dwelling would be also set away from the common boundary of No.69 by approximately the same distance as No.69. It is noted that the proposed dwelling would sit slightly in front of No.69. The use of full render on the proposal makes it more in keeping with No.65, than the donor dwelling, though is still of a similar material palette to the donor dwelling.

7. Given the mix of semi-detached and terrace properties in the local area and that the proposed dwelling is of similar design to Nos. 65 and 67 there would be no material harm to the character and appearance of the street scene if this new dwelling was built.
8. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the local area. On this basis, the proposal complies with Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan 2022 (Local Plan), which seeks to ensure efficient use of land while meeting high design standards that are sympathetic to its context.

Parking provision

9. The proposal seeks to convert an existing area of front lawn and path in front of the donor dwelling to create parking spaces for the existing dwelling. The current driveway would be given to the new dwelling to provide for its parking. The street has a resident parking scheme that during my site visit was well used. A representation from neighbouring residents provides evidence of the level of on street parking on a few specific occasions.
10. The submitted drawing shows two parking spaces for both the proposed and donor dwelling. The parking for the donor dwelling shows one parking space directly in front of the front door, with the other in very close proximity. Space would be left to allow bin storage for the donor dwelling.
11. The proposed parking for the donor dwelling, as shown, would either likely make access into and out of the dwelling difficult by placing a car too close to the front door, or would not provide suitable bin storage or could lead to a car overhanging the public footpath. In any of these options the proposed parking arrangement would either cause a problem for future residents of the donor dwelling or an obstacle for pedestrians on the public highway. Therefore, two cars have not been shown to practically be able to park in front of the donor dwelling.
12. While an alternative acceptable design for parking provision for the donor dwelling might be possible, details of a precise condition have not been provided for consideration. In addition, given that this issue of parking is of a local concern to residents, a standard condition could also deprive residents from having the opportunity to consider and comment on an alternative design.
13. While it is accepted that not all dwellings in the locality meet the current parking standards, likely due to when the dwellings were built, this does not mean the lack of suitable parking in the vicinity should be further exacerbated.
14. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal as shown would not provide suitable parking provision. On this basis, the proposal does not comply with Policies BE13 and BE14 of the Local Plan, which seek to provide suitable parking and storage of refuse and recycling.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR