
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2017

by Kenneth Stone BSc Hons DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/17/3172273
20 Station Avenue, Rayleigh SS6 9AD

- 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 M Oakley against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00037/FUL, dated 15 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as 'demolish existing garage and construct two storey side extension incorporating garage and roof lantern to rear extension, new roof and raise ridge height to provide room in roof with roof lights, new driveway and vehicle crossover onto Station Avenue'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The property the subject of this appeal is a detached two storey dwelling located at the junction of Station Avenue and Glebe Road. The property is a more modern infill addition located in an estate predominantly of two storey properties of similar age and design from around the 1960's or 1970's, according to the Council; the area has the appearance of an original Council estate from that period.
 4. The proposed development would result in significant alterations and extensions to the appeal property, much of the footprint of which has been approved under a previous extant permission. The proposed development includes a newly formed roof with rooms in the roof void. In order to accommodate the accommodation in the roof the roof is provided with relatively steeply pitched slopes and a truncated form to restrain the overall height of the ridge to a height similar to those surrounding. The truncated roof form would be discernible and noticeable in the locality from a number of viewpoints, in particular along Station Avenue and in Glebe Road. Whilst it is true the flat roof itself would not be visible, the square section and truncated form of the roof would be readily apparent from the three quarter views and visible ridge lines to the front, flank and rear roof slopes.
-

5. The proposed roof form with the flat roof section and steeper pitches would add to the overall scale and bulk of the building and given its corner location would be located in a particularly prominent position. The building form would appear at odds with the general character of the area and give this property undue prominence in the locality. The surrounding properties are generally closely spaced semi-detached and detached houses with shallow pitched roofs with gable ends and ridge lines running parallel to the road. Whilst there are a few exceptions to the general character of properties, including an extended pair of older properties on the opposite side of the junction and more modern chalet bungalow style properties further to the north west along Station Avenue, it is the general 1960's/70's housing that produces the predominant character and style in the area.
6. The proposed development would appear as an incongruous addition to the property and in the locality which would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would conflict with policy CP1 in the Rochford District Council Core Strategy (2011) and policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Development management Plan (2014). Collectively these policies seek high quality design that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the locality within which it is located. These are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 17, the core planning principles, and paragraphs 56, 60 and 64 related to design. With paragraph 64 advising that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunity for improving the character and quality of an area.

Other matters

7. The appellant contends that the Council has not identified any other concerns with regard to the development and that it is therefore acceptable in all other regards. However, the lack of a negative impact is not a positive attribute of the scheme or a benefit to which weight can be attached.

Overall conclusions

8. I conclude that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the original property and the surrounding area and would thereby conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that would lead to a different decision and determination other than in accordance with the development plan and therefore the scheme should be refused.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR