



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2021

by J Woolcock BNatRes MURP DipLaw MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3270596

51 Reeds Way, Wickford SS12 0EA

- 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 Tony Hedges against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application No:20/01332/FULL, dated 23 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is a 3 bedroom end terrace house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the side garden of a two-storey semi-detached house. The existing house has pedestrian access to the front via a footpath and vehicular access to the rear off a short access road that serves several other properties. The plot has a long side frontage to Reeds Way. It lies within an established residential area of detached and semi-detached dwellings, chalet bungalows and bungalows. The dwellings in the vicinity are generally set back from the road, which gives the area a sense of spaciousness.
4. The proposed 3-bedroom end terrace house would infill a large part of the open area at the side of the existing semi-detached house. Its proximity to the street would give the proposed end terrace house considerable prominence in the street scene. Given its footprint and design the proposal would erode the feeling of spaciousness along Reeds Way. The front and rear two-story projections with gables would be dominant features. The clipped hip gable at the front would not significantly reduce this effect. Given the overall scale and design of the building, I consider that it would appear as a disproportionate and incongruous addition to the street scene. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
5. Other properties in the locality have been extended in various ways, but these additions do not dominate the host building and are not prominent in the street scene. The extensions and additions that I was referred to and saw at my site visit do not justify granting planning permission for the appeal scheme.

6. The proposal would result in material harm to the character of the surrounding area and to the street scene contrary to saved Basildon District Local Plan Policy BE12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole. An additional dwelling would gain support from local and national policy to increase the supply of housing, especially where the Council can only demonstrate a deliverable housing land supply of approximately 2.4 years when assessed against the current objectively assessed housing need. However, the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area would bring the proposal into conflict with paragraph 130 of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, which provides that decisions should ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture. I find that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the *Framework* taken as a whole.

Other Matters

7. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the evidence, including local concerns about the likely effects on the living conditions of neighbours and vehicle access considerations. However, I am satisfied that the relationship with neighbouring properties would not result in unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, noise or disturbance. Subject to appropriate planning conditions the proposal would not be detrimental to highway safety, capacity or efficiency. I note that there is no objection from the highway authority. None of the other matters raised, are sufficient to outweigh my conclusions on the main issue, which have led to my decision on this appeal.

Conclusion

8. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Woolcock

INSPECTOR