

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2017

by P Jarvis Bsc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/16/3176110

100 Upland Road, Billericay, Essex CM12 0LD

- 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 and Mrs Nicholas and Johanna Freeman against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/00096/FULL dated 24 January 2017 was refused by notice dated 20 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is front, side, rear extensions and first floor development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The dwelling on the appeal site is a detached bungalow with steep hipped roof. It is adjoined by a pair of semi-detached bungalows of similar height to one side and a chalet style property on the other side, the ridge height of which is higher than that of the bungalow on the appeal site. Upland Road to the east of the site lies at a higher level, with the land sloping down towards the appeal site, such that the dwelling on it is readily visible in streetscene views along this approach.
 4. Other dwellings, both in this western end of Upland Road and in the nearby Brightside, are also predominantly single storey and chalet bungalows. However, there is a notable difference between this immediate setting of the appeal site and the wider locality of Upland Road and Brightside, where there is more variety with two storey detached and semi-detached dwellings.
 5. The proposal involves the extension and alteration of the existing bungalow to create a 'full' two-storey dwelling with hipped roof. It would be wider than the existing bungalow, extending across approximately half of the drive to the side and would be 'squared off' to the rear.
 6. This would result in a considerably larger dwelling on the site, with noticeably higher eaves and of far greater bulk and size than either adjoining property. In addition, it would have a greater ridge height and would introduce a long, relatively high flank elevation, which would be highly visible in streetscene views to the east of the site due to the much lower height and relative set back
-

of the adjoining bungalow at 98. I consider that this would result in an incongruous and overly dominant form of development, exacerbated by its relatively close relationship to both adjoining properties, which would not be compatible with its immediate surroundings.

7. Whilst as I have noted above the wider area does contain two storey dwellings of similar height, none appeared to be as large nor as dominant in the streetscene. The appellants have also referred to, and provided photographs of, a number of sites, which provide examples of two-storey dwellings located adjacent to single-storey properties. Whilst acknowledging that such relationships are not uncommon in the wider area, it is my view that in this particular instance, having regard to the immediate setting of the appeal site, such a relationship would not be appropriate for the reasons given above. This would appear to concur with the findings of the Inspector in the earlier appeal¹ where the site was described as being 'within a group of considerably smaller dwellings'. As such I do not consider that these examples provide any precedent for the proposal.
8. I also note that the proposal would provide an enhanced family dwelling suited to the needs of the appellants and that there is no objection from third parties. However, these factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon Local Plan Saved Policies (2007), which seeks to ensure that new residential development does not cause material harm to the character of the surrounding area or streetscene. With regard to the Basildon District Council Development Control Guidelines (1997) whilst there is compliance with a number of the guidelines, for the above reasons, I find that it does not satisfy DC1, which seeks development that respects or enhances the existing character of the area. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks developments of good design that contribute positively to making places better for people and that add to the overall quality of the area. I consider that the material considerations do not outweigh these conflicts.
10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/V1505/D/17/3168404