

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 28 September 2021

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/W/21/3270186

19 Parklands Avenue, RAYLEIGH, SS6 8JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Shaun Glazebrook against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01032/OUT, dated 2 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application was made in outline with all matters of detail reserved for future consideration. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis and I have treated any details on the submitted drawings relating to access, layout, scale and appearance as being illustrative only.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises an area to the side of 19 Parklands Avenue, a semi-detached two storey dwelling. Parklands Avenue comprises semi-detached two storey dwellings and is predominately residential in character. The majority of Parklands Avenue is characterised by dwellings evenly spaced in a linear pattern, which provides a consistency to the built form which contributes to the pleasant suburban character.
5. The appeal site is located on the corner of Parklands Avenue and Kings Road. It is currently enclosed by a hedgerow which extends along the boundary of Kings Road. As a result of its location on the corner, the plot is particularly prominent within the estate. The site is also located opposite to a footpath which runs between Kings Road and Trinity Road. The introduction of built form in close proximity to the public footpath, would enable views of the building and would be prominent to those entering Kings Road from the footpath.

6. The application is in outline, with all matters reserved, however the indicative block plan shows a development comprising an extension to form an additional dwelling, attached to the end of 19 Parklands Avenue. Whilst this is an outline application, and layout is not before me for consideration, the introduction of a dwelling on the site would disrupt the overall rhythm of the area, resulting in a contrived and incongruous form of development.
7. The development of the side garden would increase the density of development within the locality which, as a result of a number of side gardens which run parallel with Kings Road, has a generally spacious feel. I consider that the siting of a dwelling, either as shown on the indicative layout, or within any other part of the plot would introduce a discordant and incongruous feature which would also be highly visible from the public footpath. The development of the side garden would result in an urbanising affect which would be out of character with this part of Kings Road.
8. It has been put to me that the existing extension at 1 Parklands Avenue demonstrates that it is possible for the overall character of the estate to evolve and change over time. However, I do not consider that this example which is for an extension to an existing dwelling rather than a separate dwelling, has altered significantly the overall spacious character of the estate, which the proposed development would erode. In addition, the proposed dwelling would lead to a more intensive use of the site than an extension. This would include an associated increase in domestic paraphernalia and the need for an additional access for vehicles and parking. Therefore, I have given this example limited weight.
9. The appellant has also cited other examples of estates where semi-detached dwellings have been extended to create additional dwellings, however these are within neighbouring authorities where different policies would be applicable and therefore the same considerations may not apply. Therefore, I have given these examples limited weight.
10. Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Rochford District Council, Local Development Framework Development Management Plan 2014 (DMP) would support development which is designed to promote the character of the locality and has been designed to reflect the existing street pattern of the locality. The proposal before me does not adequately reflect the existing street pattern, which is characterised by semi-detached dwellings and therefore would fail to promote the character of the area, contrary to the aforementioned policies.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would introduce a discordant built form to the locality that would be out of keeping with and harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with policies DM1 and DM3 of the DMP.

Other Matters

12. The appeal site falls within a 'Zone of influence' as set out within the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy for a coastal European designated site. As the competent decision making authority, if I had been minded to allow the appeal it would have been necessary for me to complete an Appropriate Assessment for this scheme. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I have not taken the matter further.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Pannell

INSPECTOR