
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2021

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/20/3264564

157 Moreland Avenue, Thundersley, Benfleet, Essex SS7 4JJ

- 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 Chris Fox against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/0453/FUL was refused by notice dated 14 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension with a hip roof over.
-

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 existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a predominately residential area comprising a mix of dwellings in terms of scale and design of properties. Nevertheless, there is a uniformity of layout and of dwellings of predominately traditional design. Gaps between two-storey dwellings usually contain single-storey structures such as side projections or garages. Where there is a set back of two-storey development on corner sites, this openness makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 4. Guidance in RDG2 in the Castle Point Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2013) states that the space around a dwelling should be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings. Where there is a distinct character of development which creates an exceptionally strong pattern, development must not result in a disruption to this pattern. Where there is no clear pattern of development the space around a dwelling should be proportionate to the size of the dwelling and should seek to provide at least one metre between the properties and the boundary.
 5. SPD guidance RDG4 seeks to ensure that new development on corner plots is informed by the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of
-

- development, however it must not repeat poor forms of development. Active frontages should be provided to all elevations.
6. The appeal property lies on a prominent corner location. It is a two-storey detached dwelling with a single-storey set back side projection. The proposal includes a two-storey side extension extending across the area of the existing side projection and extending forward with a slight setback on the front façade. The proposed extension would retain a one metre gap to the side boundary. Nevertheless, due to the two-storey scale and bulk of the proposal at this prominent corner location, I consider that there would not be sufficient isolation space to provide a satisfactory setting for the dwelling. It would appear cramped within the site.
 7. The flank wall of the proposed extension would have no fenestration. It would appear as a stark elevation, which would appear as an incongruous addition to the dwelling and streetscene. It would not provide an active frontage, creating no opportunity for natural surveillance.
 8. In reaching my conclusion I have taken into consideration all matters raised including the development at 78 Eversley Road. That development is not a characteristic of the area and is not the same design as the proposal before me, which I have determined on its individual merits.
 9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to SPD guidance and contrary to saved Policy EC2 in the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (1998) where it seeks a high standard of design. I consider this policy is broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework particularly where the Framework seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR