

**SITE PLAN ATTACHED**

**121 COXTIE GREEN ROAD PILGRIMS HATCH SOUTH WEALD  
BRENTWOOD ESSEX CM14 5PT**

**DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION. REPOSITIONING OF FRONT DOOR INCLUDING THE ADDITION OF FRONT PORCH. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO FRONT DORMERS. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. ENLARGEMENT OF EXISTING REAR DORMER. ALERTATIONS TO FENESTRATION AND ADDITION OF SAFETY RAILS TO REAR TERRACE.**

**APPLICATION NO: 21/00550/HHA**

**WARD** South Weald **8/13 WEEK DATE** 1 June 2021

**PARISH** **POLICIES**

**CASE OFFICER** Mr Max Gibson 01277 312500

**Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:** 8529-05; 8529-03; 8529-04; 8529-05/A; 8529-08/A; 8529-09/A; 8529-02/B; 8529-06/B; Site location Plan;

This application has been referred by Cllr McLaren for the following reason:

*'The size of the applicant's development is modest and will have no impact from a greenbelt / openness perspective.*

*The officer is using the existing detached garage as a reference point for measuring impact, which I believe is inappropriate.*

*The applicant has already removed a significant, unsightly (and impractical) side extension. The impact of the proposed small first floor addition in my view causes far less harm to the neighbourhood / streetscene than the harm that was caused by the extension that has been removed.'*

In the referral agreement email reference was also made to development on a nearby site (estimated at 100m away) which is commented on as 'three storey houses that can't be far from being twice as high and far more out of character than this.'

## 1. **Proposals**

This application proposes the demolition of existing single storey side and rear additions and the construction of a two storey side extension, two front dormers, enlargement of an existing rear dormer, repositioning of front door to include addition of porch at front, alterations to fenestration and add safety rails to rear terrace at No. 121 Coxtie Green Road, Pilgrims Hatch.

## 2. **Policy Context**

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005

Policy CP1 General Development Criteria

Policy H17 Dormer Windows

Policy GB1 New Development

Policy GB2 Development Criteria

Emerging Local Development Plan (LDP) to 2033:

The Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 remains the Development Plan and its policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF - the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.

The emerging Local Development Plan went through Pre-Submission (Publication Draft) Stage (Regulation 19) consultation early in 2019 with a further focused consultation, following revisions to the detailed wording of some of the proposed housing allocations, later in the year. The plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in February 2020. The Examination in Public hearing sessions opened in December 2020, concentrating on strategic matters, with hearings on more detailed matter held at the beginning of February 2021, as set out in draft timetabling by the Secretary of State. Provided the Inspector finds the plan to be sound, it is projected that it could be adopted by the Council later in 2021/ early 2020.

As the emerging plan advances and objections become resolved, more weight can be applied to the policies within it. At this stage there are outstanding objections to be resolved, nevertheless, the Plan provides a good indication of the direction of travel in terms of aspirations for growth in the Borough and where development is likely to come forward through draft housing and employment allocations. While

the examination is a further step in progress towards adoption, because the plan has yet to complete its progress through the Examination in Public it is still considered that it currently has limited weight in the decision making process.

#### National Policy

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

### **3. Relevant History**

- 20/00874/HHA: Demolition of existing single storey rear projection and the construction of two front dormers, enlargement of an existing rear dormer, repositioning of front door to include addition of open porch at front, single storey side extension and alterations to the fenestration. -Application Refused
- 20/01478/HHA: Demolition of existing single storey side/rear addition, add single storey side extension, construct two front dormers, enlargement of an existing rear dormer, repositioning of front door to include addition of open porch at front, alterations to fenestration and add safety rails to rear terrace. -Application Permitted
- 21/00104/HHA: Demolition of existing single storey side/rear addition, add two storey side extension, construction of two front dormers, enlargement of an existing rear dormer, repositioning of front door to include addition of porch at front, alterations to fenestration and add safety rails to rear terrace. -Application Refused

### **4. Neighbour Responses**

No neighbour comments were received.

### **5. Consultation Responses**

Not applicable.

### **6. Summary of Issues**

The application site consists of a semi-detached bungalow located in a rural area along Coxtie Green Road. The dwelling has been extended by way of a single storey rear and side extension (including loggia open to the elements, WC, utility roof, lobby and study) and a hip to gable extension and rear dormer. Additionally, a large double garage is in close proximity to the application property and is considered as an adjunct for planning purposes, its use being incidental to the dwellinghouse. In addition to this, there are a number of outbuildings in the rear garden.

The proposal includes the retention of the existing 5.5 metre by 6.6 metre rear extension, enlargement of an existing rear dormer to mirror that of the adjoining No. 119 including new safety rails; a two storey side extension with a width of 3.9 metres and depth of the original dwelling (8.4 metres) with the enlarged dormer extended to the width of the entire rear roof space, two front dormers and a porch.

In addition to this, the side driveway would be/ has been paved and the large garage adjunct to the dwelling would be retained.

## **Green Belt**

The site is in the greenbelt which washes over the locality, to a significant distance in each direction. This is shown on the map that accompanies the local plan. There is no proposal to remove it from the emerging LDP. The committee will be aware that the government attaches great importance to the greenbelt. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open.

Policies GB1 and GB2 aim to control development but support a limited range of development, subject to being appropriate to the greenbelt and protecting its openness. These policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF, but where there is a difference between it and the Development Plan, the NPPF, which is newer than the development plan, takes preference. The later document is a more up to date and concise statement of greenbelt policy.

The NPPF stipulates that new buildings are inappropriate development in the greenbelt, unless one of a short list of quoted exceptions in paragraph 145. From the submission I have identified the proposal should be considered under 145 (c):

*c)- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.*

The NPPF does not state how to measure whether an extension is 'disproportionate' but since retaining openness is the fundamental aim of national policy a comparison of existing and proposed increases in bulk (volume) is considered the appropriate method. In this instance the visual impact of the proposal compared to the original property has been assessed.

The application property has been extended significantly in the past, this is detailed in the 'History' section of the report. There have already been significant additions to the original property that are considered to be disproportionate to the original building. It is noted from a site visit that the WC, utility and part of the lobby have been demolished recently and the garden part covered in patio, therefore this has been included as existing built form in the Green Belt assessment.

The proposal includes the removal of a single storey side/ rear element which would reduce some of the built form.

However, the proposal would result in the original hipped roof semi- detached bungalow being extended at two storeys to the side with a hip to gable roof design, a large rear dormer extending the width of the extended dwellings rear roofscape, two dormer windows to the front, a flatted roof rear extension and porch at the front, as well as adjunct garage. This additional built form, compared to both the original and existing building, would result in significant and disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

In regard to the proposals impact on the openness of the Green Belt, the additional built form proposed would increase the overall bulk of the original dwelling. Not only would the original footprint be increased significantly, but much of the bulk is also located at first floor which is a considerable change from the original hipped roof profile.

When considering the prominence of the extensions from Coxtie Green Road there would be an impact on the openness of the Green Belt in spatial terms. When read in correlation with the previous extensions to the dwelling as well as the adjunct garage, the proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

*“143. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.*

*144. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. ‘Very special circumstances’ will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.”*

The last sentence is particularly worthy of note. Even were there to be very special circumstances they would need to *clearly out weigh* the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, which is a much higher threshold than an on balance judgement.

Therefore, the acceptability of the proposal is wholly reliant on very special circumstances meeting the threshold set out in paragraph 144 above i.e. *the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.*

The applicant has not advanced any ‘very special circumstances’ for consideration. The desire to have more or new accommodation is understandable, but the existing building is of a standard and size that can accommodate family living. The seemingly innocuous or well merited built form within the green belt cumulatively undermines green belt objectives.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in conflict with policies GB1 and GB2 of the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan (BRLP) and the NPPF.

### **Design, character and appearance**

The extensions proposed in this application would widen the existing dwelling by 3.9 metres to the side, in a prominent location, across two storeys and with additional dormers at the front that would be further spaced than the adjacent dwellings. Also, the rear roof space includes the extension of an existing dormer spanning the width of the extended rear roof space which would dominate the rear roofscape and go beyond the existing scale of bulk in the roofscape at No. 119.

As the enlarged and proposed dormer would extend almost the entire width and depth of the rear roofscape, these elements would dominate the rear roofscape retaining only a limited strip of roof tiles to one side which would be out of scale and poorly related to the roof, therefore in conflict with Policy H17 of the BRLP.

In summary, the proposed dormer extension would be dominant and bulky in the rear roofscape and the proposal includes extensions that are not subordinate to the original or adjacent dwelling which have a cumulative result in an unbalancing of a pair of semidetached dwellings, resulting in harm to the visual amenity and character of the surrounding area.

The proposal therefore conflicts with policy CP1 (i) and (iii) and H17 of the BRLP, the NPPF and the National Design Guide.

### **Conclusion**

When considering the extensions/ adjunct development that has been constructed within the application site, the proposal is considered to result in inappropriate development in the Green Belt and harm to the visual amenity and character and appearance of the surrounding area. This therefore conflicts with policies CP1, H17, GB1 and GB2 of the BRLP, the NPPF and the National Design Guide and is recommended for refusal.

## **7. Recommendation**

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1           U0040185

The proposal, as a result of its bulk and massing, would result in disproportionate additions to the original property at No. 121 Coxtie Green Road and a reduction in Green Belt openness; therefore the proposal would not meet any exception for

development in the Green Belt and represents inappropriate development in the Green Belt, in conflict with Policies GB1 and GB2 of the BRLP and Chapter 13 of the NPPF. Other matters that may weigh in favour of the proposal have been considered individually and collectively but they do not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. Therefore, very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt do not exist.

R2 U0040186

The proposal, by way of its design and bulk, would result in a dwelling with dominant and bulky rear dormer additions and extensions that are not subordinate to the original or adjacent dwelling. When viewed cumulatively this would result in an unbalancing of a pair of semidetached dwellings, resulting in harm to the visual amenity and the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies CP1 (i) and (iii) and H17 of the BRLP, the NPPF and the National Design Guide.

#### Informative(s)

1 INF01

Reason for approval: The proposal would accord with the relevant policies of the development plan as set out below.

2 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, H17, GB1, GB2, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 and NPPG 2014.

3 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

4 INF25

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development. Details of the pre-application service can be found on the Council's website at [www.brentwood.gov.uk/preapplicationadvice](http://www.brentwood.gov.uk/preapplicationadvice)

#### *BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS*

#### **DECIDED:**

