

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by H Lock BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/16/3160062

26 Heeswyk Road, CANVEY ISLAND, Essex, SS8 8ET

- 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 Ms Deanna Britten & Tia Hudson White against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 16/0359/FUL was refused by notice dated 13 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is two storey front extension and front canopy and part two storey part single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey front extension and front canopy and part two storey part single storey rear extension at 26 Heeswyk Road, CANVEY ISLAND, Essex, SS8 8ET, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 16/0359/FUL, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1478/200/A; 1478/300/D; and 1478/S1/D.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The road name of the site address given on the planning application form differs from the spelling used on other documents. For accuracy, I have used the address given on the appeal documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey front extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Background

4. Planning permission exists for a single storey front extension and front canopy, first floor rear extension over existing single storey rear extension and single storey rear extension, under application ref. 15/0988/FUL. These elements are
-

included in the appeal proposal, but the two-storey front extension is the feature in dispute in this appeal.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey house within a street scene of dwellings which vary in terms of size and design. The perception is of a generally well established building line, but within this there is some deviation. As noted by the Council, there are single storey front extensions, porches and canopies which add interest, but there are also examples of two-storey buildings sited forward of neighbouring properties. These two-storey projections are not prevalent, but they nonetheless contribute to the variety in the street scene.
6. The extant planning permission has established that single storey front projections, including a deep canopy, are acceptable in terms of the character and appearance of the appeal site and the wider street scene. The proposed two-storey element would not project forward of the approved depth, and would be set some distance behind the porch canopy. In the context of the overall width and height of the dwelling, the proposed two-storey extension would not appear as a dominant or visually intrusive addition to the property.
7. Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Local Plan 1998 (LP) seeks high standards of design, and requires development to be appropriate to its setting in matters such as scale, siting and design; it should not harm the character of its surroundings. In support of this policy, RDG3 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) requires development to be informed by the prevailing building lines. Whilst I note the Council's view that the northern side of Heeswyck Road has a strong building line, I do not find it to be 'exceptionally strong' as termed in RDG3. Moreover, in the wider street scene, the proposal would be no more intrusive than the existing two-storey dwellings sited forward of their neighbours, and it would not disrupt an established pattern in a manner that is not already found in this road. In this context, it would not be inconsistent with the character of the area.
8. SPD Paragraph 5.5.10 notes the importance of evaluating each case on its individual merits. Given that the proposal would be of a design, material, scale, roof pitch and detailing which would complement the dwelling and those in the surrounding streetscene, it would accord with the requirements of RDG3.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would be appropriate to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider street scene, and would accord with the aims of LP Policy EC2 and SPD guidance RDG3.
10. The National Planning Policy Framework establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development, and part of its environmental strand is to contribute to protecting and enhancing the built environment. A core planning principle of the Framework is to always seek to secure high quality design. For the reasons given above the proposal would comply with this principle and would constitute sustainable development supported through the Framework. As a consequence, I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR