

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by C J Leigh BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/16/3157708

31 Lambourne, Canvey Island, Essex, SS8 0FG

- 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 Mrs Claire Sedgwick against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0223/FUL, dated 20 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is rear and side extensions, and to raise ridge to include front and rear dormers in roofspace and porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on, firstly, the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, secondly, the living conditions of adjoining occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property lies at the entrance to an area of housing that comprises a relatively modern estate where there is good consistency in the design, scale and appearance of buildings. These see traditional pitched roofs, with similar ridge heights, and where the depth and scale of the buildings is also generally consistent. Due to the siting of the appeal property facing Lambourne and adjoining Thorney Bay Road, there are long views of the front, side and rear elevations of the house.
 4. The proposed development would see the raising of the ridge height, the steepening of the roof pitch and the provision of three dormer windows in the front roofslope, with two dormers in the rear roof linked by a flat roofed area. The overall depth of the house would be considerably increased through the proposed two storey rear extension. These changes would drastically alter the appearance and scale of the house, leading to a building that appears very much out of character with the generally consistent appearance of the nearby properties due to the changes to the roof and the depth of the building. These changes would be discordant with that established character, and this notable
-

difference would upset the settled character of the residential area. The details of the proposed works would further heighten this discordancy, with the number, design and scale of the dormer additions being unsympathetic additions to the house and wider area.

5. On the first issue it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and this would be contrary to saved Policies EC2 and H17 of the Castle Point Local Plan 1998, and Policy RDG7 in the Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2012, the general thrust of which seek to ensure a high standard of design in all new development.

Living conditions

6. There is currently a staggered building line between No. 31 and the neighbour at No. 30. The proposed rear extension would bring windows at first floor level further into the depth of the appeal site, and introduce additional windows within the roof. This arrangement would lead to increased overlooking to the adjoining property, which would lead to material harm to the levels of privacy experienced by existing residents.
7. The depth of the proposed extension would also bring the appeal property closer to the rear boundary with the Thorney Bay Road properties to the west. With the provision of the additional windows in the roofspace, this would lead to an increase in levels of overlooking to the garden of the adjoining house, and I note is substantially shorter than the distance set out in the Council's SPD for separation of windows and boundaries.
8. On the second issue it is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, and so conflict with saved Policy EC2 of the Local Plan and Policy RDG5 of the SPD.

Other considerations

9. The appellant wishes to have additional accommodation in order to continue and increase her role as a foster parent. I acknowledge the value of this objective, but I must balance such a material consideration against other matters of acknowledged importance. In this case, for the reasons set out above it is my judgement that the harm arising in respect of the two main issues, and consequential conflict with the development plan, outweighs this consideration. Therefore, the conclusions remain, and the appeal is dismissed.

C J Leigh
INSPECTOR