



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

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

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/17/3170376

46 The Driveway, Canvey Island, Essex, SS8 0AD.

- 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 Alan Brooks against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0872/FUL, dated 5 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is to convert bungalow into a two-storey house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal, 46 The Driveway, is a detached two-bedroom bungalow. It is located on the south side of the road. There are some examples of chalets and two-storey houses in the road. However, as I observed, bungalows represent the overwhelming form and character of the development in The Driveway and, more particularly, in the immediate proximity of the appeal property.
4. The appellant proposes, while retaining the existing footprint, to add a new first floor turning this bungalow into a two-storey house. The design of the proposed house would reflect the style and age of the existing bungalow. In itself the principal façade would therefore appear as well proportioned and balanced. However, in contrast, due to the limited fenestration and the proportion of void to solid, the side elevations would be bland and unattractive.
5. I note that the ridge would only be raised by about 2.6 metres. Nevertheless, the property as extended would have the form, mass and appearance of a detached house. In my judgement, it would therefore appear as a prominent and incongruous form of development in the context of the built form of the surrounding development.
6. As a result, the proposed development would not accord with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as the introduction of

a two-storey dwelling here would not serve to improve the character and quality of the area. Furthermore, in respect of paragraph 65 to which my attention has also be drawn, I am not persuaded, due to the lack of evidence to the contrary, that the proposal would promote such a high level of sustainability or indeed would be of such a good design as to outweigh its incompatibility with the existing townscape.

7. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development would detract from and thereby cause harm to the character and appearance of both the streetscene and the wider area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (Adopted 17 November 1998) and the guidance in the Framework as they require the scale, siting and design of development to be appropriate to its setting so as to not cause harm to the character of its surroundings.

Other matters

8. The appellant has referred me to, and I have had regard to, a number of former bungalows that have been extended and altered in various ways to form two-storey dwellings along both The Driveway and The Parkway. However, I do not consider them to be an appropriate justification for permitting the proposed development here where the retained character of the development is clearly low rise.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to the issue of flood risk and the benefits that may result from the proposal in this respect. However, in view of the significant harm I have identified this consideration does not outweigh my findings on the main issue.

Conclusions

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposal is not in accordance with the development plan, when read as a whole, and that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR