
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 September 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/21/3275227

1 Jason Close, Canvey Island, SS8 9QT

- 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 K Davidson against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0145/FUL, dated 16 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'two storey side extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I am satisfied that the updates to the Framework do not materially affect its content insofar as it is relevant to the main issues of this appeal, and I am therefore satisfied that no parties have been prejudiced by my having regard to it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two storey dwelling, located at the junction of Jason Close and Farm Road. The proposal is for a part single storey, part two storey side extension.
5. Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Local Plan, Written Statement, Adopted 17 November 1998 (LP) requires a high standard of design in relation to new buildings and extensions. In particular, it states that regard is to be given to the scale, density, siting, design, layout and external materials of any development, which should not harm the character of its surroundings.
6. The Council also refer to RDG2 and RDG4 of the Residential Design Guidance¹ (SPD). RDG2 states that space around a new development should be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings. Where there is no clear

¹ Castle Point Residential Design Guidance, Supplementary Planning Document, Adopted 1 January 2013

pattern of development the space around a dwelling should be proportionate to the size of the dwelling. It should seek to provide at least 1m between the properties and the boundary. RDG4 requires development on corner plots to be designed to turn corners and provide active frontages to all elevations that face the public realm with articulation and fenestration at all floor levels. Whilst the SPD does not form part of the development plan, it does nonetheless provide useful guidance for assessing proposals.

7. I acknowledge that the surrounding area is relatively mixed in terms of the amount of space around dwellings and the proximity to boundaries. However, the appeal property occupies a prominent corner location and the existing dwelling and the dwelling on the opposing corner of Jason Close are set back from the road frontage with low boundaries enclosures, which gives an open character to the entrance to the street.
8. The proposed side extension would be set back from the boundary of the site with Jason Close by about 1.1 metres (other than for the ground floor bay window which would be closer). The effect of the proposal would be to significantly reduce the amount of space around the dwelling which currently contributes to its setting. In my view, the proposed side extension by virtue of its part two storey height and its overall size, scale and siting, would appear cramped in relation to the boundary of the site and would be unduly prominent in the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The amount of space retained around the dwelling would not be proportionate to its size as required by RDG2 of the SPD.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would continue to address Jason Close in terms of its articulation and fenestration and would not be contrary to RDG4 of the SPD in this regard. However, RDG4 also states that development on corner plots should be informed by the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of development, and that it must not repeat poor forms of development. In my view, the proposal would detract from the openness of the corner plot and would be harmful to the overall character of the area, in conflict with this aspect of the guidance.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and accordingly would be contrary to Policy EC2 of the LP, RDG2 and RDG4 of the SPD and paragraph 130 of the Framework, which collectively require a high standard of design.

Conclusion

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

J Davis

INSPECTOR