
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1515/D/25/3369205

32 Brindles Close, Hutton, Essex CM13 2HW

- 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 Mark Chinery against the decision of Brentwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is 25/00266/HHA.
 - The development proposed is for a dormer window to rear, to include juliet balcony and velux rooflights to front to create 2nd floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dormer window to rear, to include juliet balcony and velux rooflights to front to create 2nd floor at 32 Brindles Close, Hutton, Essex CM13 2HW in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 25/00266/HHA and the plans submitted with it (location plan, 200422_11, 200422_12_A, 200422_13_A, 200422_14_C, 200422_15_C, 200422_16_B, 200422_17_A).

Preliminary Matter

2. At my site visit, I saw that the development has been completed, and I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey, semi-detached house. It is positioned on Brindles Close in a residential streetscene of properties of broadly similar scale and design. At the rear is an area of mature woodland.
5. The flat roof of the rear dormer abuts the main ridge line of the primary residence. From the front, larger bonnet tiles are evident to facilitate the height of the scheme, however, these are very modest in nature and have no adverse effect upon the street scene.
6. At the rear, I note that the proximity to the ridge means that the feature lacks a degree of subservience. Nonetheless, although the dormer window is relatively large, an amount of tiling remains visible to either side with the party wall and the gable end, and similarly at eaves level several rows are evident between the wall

plate and the base of the dormer. As a result, the extent of the feature is satisfactorily accommodated in these respects.

7. Moreover, the fenestration to the dormer is appropriately positioned, with openings that broadly match the locations of the windows in the first floor below. I appreciate that the use of cladding to the external surfaces contrasts somewhat with external materials used elsewhere on no.32, however, the colour is fairly neutral and does not stand out within the rear garden scene.
8. I also saw at my visit that a similar arrangement exists at 38 Brindles Close a few doors along to the east, with a large rear dormer abutting the ridge line of its host building. Taken in the round, whilst not ideal, I consider that the proposal does not represent an unneighbourly form of development as to warrant a refusal of planning permission in this instance.
9. I therefore conclude that the scheme is not injurious to the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality. It meets with Policy BE14 of the Brentwood Local Plan March 2024, which requires new development of an acceptable scale that responds positively and sympathetically to its context. It is also consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

10. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. The development is complete and therefore the standard time limit and plans condition are no longer necessary, although I have listed the application plans in my decision, so it is clear what was submitted.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the foregoing and all other matters, I allow the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR