



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/19/3224852

156 Byfletts, Vange SS16 4LJ

- 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 Bartram against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01546/FULL, dated 14 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is an end terrace extension, encompassing a two storey side extension with ground floor porch projection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. An amended plan, 156B2/LZ/A/0003 Revision A dated 16/03/2019, was submitted with the appeal. This amended plan corrects an apparent error as it shows the ridgeline over the proposed side extension set lower than the ridgeline of the existing house on all elevations, where the proposed front elevation on the plan submitted with the application showed the ridgeline at the same level.
3. I am satisfied that interested parties have had the chance to comment on the amended plan, and considering the appeal on the basis of the amended plan does not prejudice the rights of any parties. It therefore forms part of my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. Byfletts is a residential street characterised by rows of terraced houses set both parallel to, and perpendicular to, the road. Two of the perpendicular rows front onto side roads, including Kent View Road. The appeal property is located at the end of a perpendicular row on the opposite side of Byfletts and faces onto a communal parking area and amenity area.
6. The various rows of terraces that front Byfletts are set back from the highway edge behind a mix of gardens, landscaped borders and front parking areas, which provide a space and relief from built form that is largely maintained and respected by the building lines of the perpendicular rows. This is particularly

evident on the southern side of Byfletts, where the appeal site is located, despite some variation in the building lines and orientations of each of the terraced rows.

7. The proposed extension would, at its closest point, be directly adjacent to the site boundary. The side extension would be built flush with the front wall, with the ridge line only slightly lower than the existing. The two-storey extension and its associated scale, bulk and massing would as a result significantly reduce the space to the side of No 156, obscure the houses to the rear and increase the prominence of 156 in a manner that would appear out of keeping with the established character of the surrounding area.
8. In reaching the above findings I have had regard to other decisions brought to my attention by the appellant. A previous appeal decision at No 156 granted permission for a single-storey side extension, among other alterations to the property. I do not find that this extension is directly comparable to the proposed, due to the difference in height between the two proposals.
9. I have also had regard to the extension that has taken place nearby on a corner plot at No 172 Byfletts which I saw on my visit. I observed that the design of that extension is different to the proposal before me, and I do not know the circumstances of that particular case. Furthermore, extensions of that style on corner plots are very much in the minority in the area with the majority of corner properties retaining some separation from the footway edge. In any event the example at 172 confirms that such side extensions appear prominent and do reduce the sense of space between the terraced road and the highway, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. I therefore consider that the presence of the extension at No 172 does not justify a further erosion of the character of the area that would arise from the appeal proposal.
10. Having regard to all of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The development would therefore be contrary to the requirements of policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies September 2007. This policy, among other considerations, indicates that the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if it causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene. The policy is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it seeks to achieve well designed places and that developments add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss the appeal.

M Chalk

Inspector