



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/20/3251482

116 Perry Street, Billericay Essex CM12 0NH

- 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 Steve Lambert Leading Builders Ltd against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01742 was refused by notice dated 21 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the extension and refurbishment of the existing bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and

the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to visual amenity.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area comprising a mix of dwellings of different scale and design including single and two-storey dwellings. Apart from the attached garage to the appeal property, there is a strong element of symmetry between this pair of semi-detached bungalows.
 4. The proposal includes a side extension out to the side boundary, creating rooms in an extended roof. This would be set back, being situated behind the existing side garage.
 5. The Council's Development Control Guidelines (approved 1993 with alterations 1997) states at DC28 that side extensions should be set back from the front wall of the dwelling and should normally be sited at least one metre from the site boundary.
-

6. Gaps at first floor level between many of the properties make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. From my observations, due to the position and bulk of the proposed side extension, it would appear as a cramped addition that would unbalance the symmetry of the main roof of this pair of semi-detached properties. The current separation space at first floor level would be lost. The neighbouring properties at Nos 114 and 112 Perry Street are somewhat closer to each other at first floor level than is characteristic of the wider area. The proposed side extension would further exacerbate this situation, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
7. The proposed side extension would be highly visible to a considerable extent within the streetscene and to occupiers of some of the neighbouring properties, particularly on the opposite side of Perry Street. Due to the cramped appearance of the proposed side extension, I consider this would have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of neighbours.
8. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and on residential amenity. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in the Council's Development Control Guidelines and contrary to saved Policy BAS BE12 in the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies (2007), where they seek to ensure that new development does not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area or residential amenity. I consider saved Policy BAS BE12 to be broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly where the Framework seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.
9. It must be acknowledged that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It sets out the three overarching objectives which are interdependent.
10. Turning to the economic objective, some very small benefit would accrue in relation to the construction of the proposal. In terms of the social objective, the proposal would provide additional living accommodation. However this would not be within a well-designed built environment. I now turn to the environmental objective. For the reasons stated above, I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The harm is so significant in terms of both the social and environmental objectives that taking the three overarching objectives together, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR