



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2020

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons), MCD, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/20/3248655

24 Derwent Avenue, Rayleigh, SS6 8LE

- 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 Howard against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01006/FUL, dated 31 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two-storey front extension, part single-storey front extension with single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling that is situated on the northern side of Derwent Avenue. The surrounding properties are also mainly semi-detached dwellings that have some variations in their design, such as integral garages that project forward varying distances from the two storey parts of the dwellings. The properties on the northern side of Derwent Avenue, around the appeal property, are on slightly staggered building lines that in part reflect the curvature in Derwent Avenue towards Helena Road. The siting of properties in this manner, despite variations in their appearance including some that have been subject to extensions and alterations, together with the open frontages which provide views over the front garden and parking areas, contribute to the pleasant residential character of the area.
4. The proposal includes a part single and part two storey extension to the front of the property. The two storey element and the forward projection of this extension would add considerable bulk and dominate the front of the appeal property. Although the neighbouring attached property may have been extended, its main two storey front elevation is aligned with the appeal property. This element of the proposed development, protruding past the front two storey building line would be a dominant addition that would change the appearance of the dwelling.
5. I was able to see at the time of my visit, as the Appellant has referenced, that many of the surrounding properties have been extended or altered. None of

the buildings however on Derwent Avenue had a two storey projection forward of the main front elevation of the respective property. I appreciate that the appeal property is setback from No. 22 and alongside the curvature in the road, this would help obscure the extension when approaching from the south-east. Nevertheless, the size of the front extension would be apparent when seen heading towards the appeal property from the north-west. My attention has been drawn to the block of flats on Derwent Avenue which extend up to the pavement. These are however situated beyond this group of semi-detached properties that the appeal site is within.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. I note the Appellant's views on Policy CP1 of the Council's Core Strategy not being specific to extensions to dwellings, but seeking to promote good, high quality design. I have also taken into account that the proposal seeks to respond to certain parts of quoted policies such as in relation to accessibility. However, the proposal would be contrary Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Plan, which along with Core Strategy Policy CP1, I consider to be of most relevance to the appeal development. These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure the design of new development promotes the character of a locality and promotes visual amenity. It would also be contrary to Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in that it would not add to the overall quality of an area or be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant is seeking to add much needed bedroom space as well as other accommodation to the dwelling that they have lived in for many years and that the property is well connected to shops and public transport connections. The proposal also gains support from various parts of the NPPF, including in relation to ensuring the vitality of centres. These factors, whilst they support the proposal, would not however outweigh the harm that would be caused by the development to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.
8. The proposal would provide sufficient amenity space and would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential occupiers. There would also be no impact on trees, ecology, open space or landscape character. The Council have also stated that the required parking provision could be secured by condition. The type of dwelling would as stated remain appropriate to the locality. These are however neutral considerations and, therefore, do not amount to benefits in favour of the proposal.
9. Reference has been made to other properties in the area which are said to be relevant to the consideration of the appeal development. Whilst some details of these referenced extensions have been provided, I am not aware of the full circumstances of those cases. I appreciate, as the Appellant has stated, that there should be consistency in decision-making. However, I can confirm that I have determined the appeal proposal before me on its own merits and found it unacceptable for the reasons set out.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, including the Council not providing a pre-application service, that the appeal development followed revisions from a previous application, that it took into account the concerns of a neighbour and that no objections have been made, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR