



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/21/3278048

52 Wash Road, Laindon, SS15 4EN

- 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 and Mrs Saunders against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00417/FULL, dated 15 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised in respect of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling forms part of a row of bungalows and chalet style properties along the south side of Wash Road, although I saw that there are two storey dwellings opposite and further along Wash Road in either direction. The site is positioned on the corner of Wash Road and Royston Avenue. The properties within Royston Avenue are also a mix of bungalows and chalet style properties. The proposal would alter the existing single storey property by adding a first storey to effectively create a two-storey dwelling.
5. The resulting development would be of substantial size with regard to its height and overall bulk. The depth of the development would create a substantial mass of development alongside Royston Avenue visible from both Wash Road and Royston Avenue. The proposed first floor extension would be a disproportionately large addition that would appear substantially out of keeping within the context of bungalows and chalet style dwellings along this part of Wash Road. The upward first floor extension would detract from the character and appearance of the street scene and would, therefore, be visually harmful for this reason. Given the corner location of the site, the visual harm arising from such a disproportionately large addition would be clearly visible in public

views from the adjacent highways and in the outlook of neighbouring existing occupiers.

6. Being of a traditional design using the existing footprint of the property and materials that would reflect that of neighbouring properties would not overcome the visual harm. Whilst it is contended that the development would provide visual interest at this corner location, given the street scene context, a two-storey dwelling would be a harmful visually dominant feature that would be conspicuously out of keeping within its immediate setting.
7. I have been directed to a development at 12 Wash Road that also has a corner siting in which the Council granted planning permission to alter a bungalow into a two-storey dwelling. I saw that the character of the street scene around 12 Wash Road is more mixed, and that property has a greater set back from adjacent highways to that of the appeal property. Although those properties immediately adjacent 12 Wash Road comprise a bungalow and chalet style property, there are two storey dwellings close by. The context in which that development would have been considered is quite different to that of the proposal that is before me where there is more uniformity to the appearance of the properties within the immediate street scene. The development at 12 Wash Road, therefore, offers little weight in favour of the proposal.
8. Other bungalows within the area have been increased in size through the creation of large dormer roof extensions, including that at 50 Wash Road that has been provided as an example. It is also highlighted that some chalet style properties have large gables to the front. A photograph illustrating two such properties has been provided. Notwithstanding these examples, the proposal would create a two-storey dwelling. This is a different development to that of chalet style bungalows. As such, the proposal can and should be considered on its own merits having regard to the context in which it is located.
9. For these above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies and the provisions of the Framework. This policy and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development not to cause harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene, and to achieve well-designed places.

Conclusion

10. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR