



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/19/3232278

9 Victoria Crescent, Wickford SS12 0DJ

- 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 Smith against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00197/FULL, dated 29 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed rear extension, roof conversion inc. first floor extension, alterations to existing front elevation.
-

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 house and wider area.

Reasons

3. Victoria Crescent is a cul-de-sac characterised predominantly by semi-detached and detached bungalows. There is variety in the roof forms of the bungalows, with a mix of hipped and gable-ended roofs, and some properties have been extended with front and/or rear dormer windows. The properties are typically separated from their detached neighbours by generous gaps, with many of the houses having driveways to the side. The rear elevations of several properties on Victoria Avenue are visible from within the street, and a number of these have rear dormer windows as well.
4. The appeal property is a hip-roofed semi-detached bungalow. The attached neighbouring property, 11 Victoria Crescent, has a two-storey rear extension and a gable-ended roof.
5. The proposed rear extension would significantly add to the bulk of the bungalow, adding a first floor at the rear of the house with a flat roof. This would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the house, and of most other houses in the wider area. The extension would be visible from neighbouring properties, and because of its size and detailed design would be a prominent addition and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. The presence of the two-storey rear extension to the attached neighbouring property is a consideration to which I afford moderate weight in determining this appeal. However, its history is unclear as the Council states that it does not have planning permission. In any event, it is not typical of the character of extensions to the rear of houses in the wider area. Additionally, I saw several large rear dormers to houses in Victoria Crescent and Victoria Avenue, but these appear to be contained within the original roof slopes of their properties, and therefore are also materially different to the proposed development in their impact.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the house and wider area. It would be contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies September 2007 (the LP), which requires extensions to existing dwellings to avoid harm to the character of the surrounding area. It would also be contrary to draft Policy DES1 of the emerging Basildon Borough Publication Local Plan 2014 2034 to which I have regard as a material consideration, which, amongst other considerations similarly requires that development contribute positively to an area's visual and architectural character.

Other Matters

8. The appellant suggests that any adverse impact arising from the proposed development would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, as set out in paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, this test is only applied where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date.
9. There is no evidence before me to suggest that Policy BAS BE12 of the LP is not relevant, nor that it is out-of-date. Rather, I find that its requirements accord with the design policies of the Framework, and in the absence of any conflict have afforded it full weight in determining this appeal. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and I have determined the appeal accordingly.
10. The proposed development would include two side-facing windows serving a landing and bathroom. These would look towards the neighbouring property at No 7 Victoria Crescent. This is a matter to which I would have given further consideration had I been otherwise minded to allow this appeal. As I am dismissing the appeal, no further consideration is required in this regard as part of my decision.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR