



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/19/3242792

4 Woodhurst Road, Canvey Island SS8 0HB

- 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 Tracey Clarke against the decision of the Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0677/FUL, dated 16 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application forms as a single storey side/rear and front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for the occupants of the appeal property, with particular regard to privacy, outlook and light; and
 - the effect of the development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached bungalow located on the southern side of Woodhurst Road which is in an established residential area. The property has a staggered front elevation as well as a paved front area. On my site visit I observed that some works have already been carried out and I am aware of a previous planning permission (ref 18/0192/FUL) for a single storey side and rear extension. This current proposal would be similar and would result in the erection of a single storey side, rear and front extension including the formation of a bedroom with a single flank window.

Living conditions

5. Given the small separation distance between the appeal property and the adjoining property at No. 6 and the facing window at No 6, the single side
-

window serving the proposed bedroom would seem to allow a close and clear view into the neighbouring property and vice versa, leading to a lack of privacy. Hence, it would in all-likelihood be permanently screened, such as by a sufficiently tall boundary fence, to avoid overlooking. However, this would result in there being a limited outlook from this room and poor access to light. Whilst this may be acceptable if the bedroom had access to another window on a different elevation that would provide additional light and outlook, none are shown on the plans. In this instance, I find the proposed development is poorly designed and would fail to provide adequate outlook and levels of natural light for the occupants.

6. Though the internal layout is not unusual, Policy RDG5 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance states that primary windows serving habitable rooms, which would include a second bedroom such as that proposed, should be located on the principal elevations of dwellings. I therefore find that the reliance on a single flank window would conflict with this Guidance.
7. In light of the foregoing, the proposed development would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for the existing and future occupants of 4 Woodhurst Road with regards to outlook and light. The development would therefore conflict with development plan Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Local Plan (the 'Local Plan') which aims to ensure new extensions are well designed in terms of layout and well related to their setting. I have also had regard to Policy RDG5 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance which seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that new developments are appropriately designed to respect privacy and provide adequate levels of natural light. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) which aims to ensure a high standard of amenity for residents.

Highway safety

8. The proposed front extension would reduce the space available for parking within the paved frontage of the property. Whilst the Council states that the site would not be able to accommodate adequately sized off-street parking spaces, I find that there would still be space within the frontage to allow for standard vehicles to park albeit within slightly smaller parking spaces. Although there may be a slight overhang in the pavement, this would be minimal and would not impede the very low flow of pedestrian circulation along this footpath. In any case, there is capacity for on-street parking to the front of the appeal property and there is no reason to suggest that on-street parking in this location would unacceptably impact highway safety. Indeed, Woodhurst Road is a quiet road with little traffic that does not appear to suffer from congestion issues related to on-street parking.
9. Given the above, although the proposal may not adhere to the Essex County Council Parking Standards and would therefore conflict with Local Plan Policy T8, I have found that it would not be detrimental to highway safety. The development would therefore accord with the NPPF which seeks to ensure proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Recommendation

10. I have found that the proposed development would not harm highway safety however this does not outweigh the failure of the proposal to provide

satisfactory living conditions for the current and future occupants of 4 Woodhurst Road.

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR