

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

CHESTNUTS HUTTON BRENTWOOD ESSEX CM13 2PA

PROPOSED 2 STOREY FRONT, SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS. FENESTRATION AND ROOF ALTERATIONS.

APPLICATION NO: 21/01738/HHA

WARD Hutton South **8 WEEK DATE** 3 December 2021

CASE OFFICER Ms Tessa Outram

Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision: 3033-L01 REV A; 3033-L02 REV A; 3033-S02; 3033-S03; 3033-S01;

This application has been referred to committee at the request of Councillor Hirst for the following reason.

- I cannot see how the proposed extension contravenes our planning regulations, and so cannot see why it is recommended for refusal. The issue of roof layout appears to be a matter of planning officer taste rather than policy.

1. Proposals

Planning permission is sought for the significant re-modelling and extension of an existing dwelling, via two storey front, rear and side extensions, new roof and alterations to fenestration, at 4 Chestnuts, Hutton Mount.

The main considerations in the determination of this application are the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area of Hutton Mount, the impact on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and parking and highway considerations and whether it has overcome the reasons for refusing the previous similar scheme.

2. Policy Context

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005

- Policy CP1 General Development Criteria
- Policy H15 Hutton Mount
- Policy T5 Parking

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The Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 remains the Development Plan and its policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).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 later that year following revisions to the detailed wording of some of the proposed housing allocations. The plan was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in February 2020. The examination hearing sessions opened in December 2020, concentrating on strategic matters, with hearings on more detailed matters held from February to July 2021. The Council proposes to make modifications to the plan and a six-week public consultation has been held, ending on 11 November 2021. The Inspectors will consider any representations made as a result of the consultation. Provided the Inspectors find the plan to be sound, it is anticipated that it could be adopted by the Council in early 2022.

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, although issues have been discussed through hearing sessions and main modifications for soundness have been published. 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 proposed housing and employment allocations. While the examination is a further step in progress towards adoption, because the plan has yet to be adopted it is still considered to have limited weight in the decision-making process.

National policy

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

3. Relevant History

- 21/01042/HHA: Proposed 2 storey front, side and rear extensions. Fenestration and roof alterations. -Application Refused. No appeal submitted.
- 19/00602/FUL: Demolition of existing dwelling and construct 5 bedroom 2 storey dwelling -Application Permitted

4. Neighbour Responses

Where applications are subject to public consultation those comments are summarised below. The full version of each neighbour response can be viewed on

the Council's website via Public Access at the following link:
<http://publicaccess.brentwood.gov.uk/online-applications/>

- No representations have been received at the time of writing this report.

5. **Consultation Responses**

- **Highway Authority:** The information that was submitted in association with the application has been fully considered by the Highway Authority. The proposal includes extensions to the property including reprovision of a larger garage, offstreet parking is also retained on the driveway, therefore:
From a highway and transportation perspective the impact of the proposal is acceptable to the Highway Authority subject to the following condition:
1. Areas within the curtilage of the site for the purpose of the reception and storage of building materials shall be identified clear of the highway.
Reason: To ensure that appropriate loading / unloading facilities are available to ensure that the highway is not obstructed during the construction period in the interest of highway safety in accordance with policy DM1.

6. **Summary of Issues**

The starting point for determining a planning application is the Development Plan, in this case the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005. Planning legislation states that applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Relevant material considerations for determining this application are the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). Although individual policies in the Local Plan should not be read in isolation, the plan contains policies of particular relevance to this proposal which are listed in section 2 above. In this case the planning history of previously determined applications is a material consideration, irrespective of whether they were officer or committee decisions.

Planning History

Permission has previously been refused for a similar proposal under application ref: 21/01042/HHA. The application was refused for the following reason:

“The development proposes unsympathetic extension of the existing building, resulting in a building of a disproportionate depth, un-characterful and poorly designed roof and an unarticulated mass and bulk of built form that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development fails to comply with local policy CP1 (i) and (iii), the NPPF (chapter 12) and the National Design Guide.”

The previous application found no material harm in respect of amenity, parking, spatial separation (H15) or the living conditions of the future occupiers. These matters remain unchanged.

Design, Character and Appearance

The differences between the refused scheme and this current proposal are minor and include a reduction in total height by 0.7m and sinking the flat top of the crown roof to the front and side which does very little to improve the scheme. The crown roof has also been increased in depth and its 'mock' nature is clearly apparent in the bulk of the roof and the treatment of the rear elevation.

Chestnuts is characterized by large, detached properties of varying styles and appearance, many of which have been replaced or extended. Whilst the material palette and style of the dwellings is varied, traditional materials are predominant within the street scene.

The proposed extensions would significantly alter the existing character of the dwelling; little of its existing form would be retained and the proposal would affectively result in the appearance of a replacement dwelling. The existing building at two storey level measures 11.4 m long and 6.1 m wide. The existing building has a steep, chalet pitched roof with ridge to the front and rear with slim steep gables to the sides. The proposal would have a tall roof with large, flatted area in the centre, forming a crown roof, to cover the expansive depth of the dwelling created by the extensions. Given its much more bulky footprint, the dwelling cannot be roofed with a conventional single range pitched roof.

The proposal would be of significantly increased bulk, 15.5m long and 14.6 m wide. Crown roofs are indicative of a roof providing a level of interior space that a pitched roof cannot accommodate. With single plane pitches surrounding a flat or submerged flat roof they do not achieve the pretence of a pitched roof, instead, resulting in a significantly bulky and contrived roof form. This is not in keeping with the Hutton Mount vernacular, which consists of predominantly pitched roof typologies. Particularly within the Chestnuts which favours a varied and articulated roofscape comprising both steep roof pitches and chalet style dwellings and two storey traditional forms.

The Development Plan's main design policy is CP1. The accompanying text to the policy says "New development of whatever scale should not be viewed in isolation but should have regard to both the immediately neighbouring buildings and the townscape/landscape of the wider area." It continues by saying that the authority has identified "the need to protect the quality and character of existing urban areas. The Council will, therefore, seek to protect existing residential areas, such as *Hutton Mount* and *Tor Bryan*, from development that would impact detrimentally on the special character of an area." The site is within one of those identified areas.

As indicated in its title, Policy CP1 contains criteria – eight - on which developments will be assessed. The policy therefore operates on the basis of clear requirements which require planning judgements; neither the policy nor the process of reaching a planning

judgement should not be downplayed as being subjective. The policy requires that any development will need to satisfy all criteria.

The Planning History section of this report, above, identifies where, in common with the last proposal, the scheme meets part of the requirements of Policy CP1. Policy CP1(i and iii) contain requirements that development proposals should be of a high standard of design compatible with their location, character of the area and any surrounding development; in the case of alterations and extensions, with the existing building, *in terms of size, siting, scale, style, design and materials*. The development fails those tests and proposes unsympathetic extensions to the existing building, resulting in a building of a disproportionate depth, un-characterful and poorly designed roof and an unarticulated mass and bulk of built form that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and visual amenity of the area, which favours traditional roof forms.

The changes from the refused scheme made in this application do not materially alter the previous assessment. The flatted area has been enlarged, the roof form remains unarticulated, is all of the same height and would appear flat when viewed from the street scene. It is not persuasive that sinking the flat top of the crown roof would materially alter this position given the depth of the dwelling which would still be apparent from neighbouring properties. Given Policy CP1's requirement for all criteria to be met and the specific design related objections identified above, the application does not comply with Policy CP1.

The development fails to overcome the previous reason for refusal is therefore contrary to local policy CP1 (i) and (iii), the NPPF (chapter 12) and the National Design Guide.

Other Matters

The planning agent has put forward two examples of crown roofs that have been permitted in the borough. The Hutton Mount example put forward in the DAS - Sussex Cottage, 2 Challacombe Close (19/00578/FUL), is not considered directly comparable. A small linear section of flatted roof was permitted, however the approved dwelling had a traditional roof form fronting Challacombe Close and the flatted section of roof was screened by the gable and hip projections to either side. The flat roof proposed with this application at Chestnuts is firstly much larger, whilst sunken is not articulated and the expanse and disproportionate depth of the dwelling is still apparent.

The London Road example (16/01468/FUL) was permitted prior to the national design guide and updated NPPF which places a greater emphasis on high quality design. The London Road example is also a much smaller area of flatted roof and again linear. Its position within the street scene within a linear row of properties would make the side elevations less noticeable from both the public and neighbouring dwellings.

It is not considered the permitted examples put forward would justify the approval of this unacceptable development. Planning does not operate on the basis of precedents, but each application is required to be assessed on its merits - in relation to the surrounding context, the crown roof proposed here is of poor architectural design, is far larger than

those approved elsewhere and would lead to a dwelling appearing unarticulated and out of character within a cul-de-sac of traditional pitched roof forms.

Furthermore, were other developments to be given significance in the planning balance it would tend to lead to a progressive reduction in quality over time. What isn't apparent from casual observation is those developments which through revision and negotiation have been improved to avoid poor design forms, for example crown roofs.

Conclusion

The previous reason for refusal has not been overcome, the development remains contrary to local and national design policy and the application is recommended for refusal.

7. **Recommendation**

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 U0043778

The development proposes unsympathetic extension of the existing building, resulting in a building of a disproportionate depth, un-characterful and poorly designed roof and an unarticulated mass and bulk of built form that would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development fails to comply with local policy CP1 (i) and (iii), the NPPF (chapter 12) and the National Design Guide.

Informative(s)

1 INF05

The following development plan policies contained in the Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005 are relevant to this decision: CP1, H15, T5, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2021 and NPPG 2014.

2 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

3 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 <https://www.brentwood.gov.uk/planning-advice-and-permissions>

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

DECIDED: