



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/W/17/3169430

Rear of 16 Kingswood Crescent, Rayleigh SS6 7BH

- 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 S Page of Page Estates Limited against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00626/FUL, dated 29 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construct a new 2-bed bungalow'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The development would involve the construction of a two bedroom bungalow on land to the rear of 16 Kingswood Crescent (No 16), a detached bungalow. The bungalow would be accessed via a private driveway that serves 1 and 2 Kingswood Mews (Nos 1 and 2), a pair of bungalows of comparatively recent construction sited behind 18 to 24 Kingswood Crescent.
4. The bungalow would occupy a comparatively small plot for the area. The confined nature of the plot would mean that the bungalow's north western corner would be sited in close proximity (one metre) to the site's northern boundary and two metres from what would be the rear boundary. The bungalow's outdoor space would therefore primarily comprise a side garden area and there would be no rear garden area to speak of. I consider the lack of space about the bungalow and the comparatively small plot area are factors that are indicative of this being an unduly intensive form of development for this area.
5. I am of the opinion that this development would not maintain the spaciousness that is characteristic of the surrounding area. I also consider that this development would not be comparable with Nos 1 and 2, whose plots are much more generous in size. The fact that Kingswood Mews is now an established development does not persuade me that its existence provides a justification for allowing what would be an unduly intensive form of development for this area. I therefore consider that the context for the

appeal development has not changed appreciably in the intervening period since the dismissal of the two previous appeals concerning this site¹. While the separation distance between Nos 1 and 2 and the new bungalow would be greater than previously proposed, that would not address the underlying concern about the plot's size and its inability to accommodate a dwelling in a manner that would be respectful of the character of the surrounding area.

6. I therefore conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There would therefore be conflict with Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Rochford Development Management Plan of 2014 because the development would be of an over intensive form and it would neither promote the character of the locality nor positively contribute to the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

7. The absence of harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining properties does not persuade me that this would be an appropriate form of development. I am also of the view that the ability of this development to provide adequate living conditions for its occupiers does not justify permission being granted.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/B1550/A/09/2104527 and APP/B1550/A/10/2120128