



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 February 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/21/3285820

118 Great Gregorie, Basildon, SS16 5QF

- 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 Edmundas Andriuska against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01190/FULL, dated 31 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as “erection of a new 2 Bed dwelling abutting No.118 Great Gregorie and alterations to access existing dwelling.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council’s emerging Local Plan has been withdrawn from examination. Its policies therefore attract no weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and,
 - Whether it would provide sufficient car parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 118 is an end-terrace dwelling, with this terrace one of two facing one another across an area of communal green space. The two terraced rows both have space to each end, which contributes to the overall character of this part of Great Gregorie.
 5. The proposed dwelling would fill the space to the side of No 118. It would detract from the spaciousness created by the gaps to the sides of each of the end terrace houses and would be an intrusive and incongruous feature in the street scene as a result.
 6. The new house would be of the same height and similar in appearance to the neighbouring houses and its appearance would not be out of keeping with the terrace that it would form part of. However, the lack of harm on these points is a neutral consideration in the determination of this appeal.
-

7. The proposed development would therefore result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan 2007 (the LP) which, amongst other criteria, states that planning permission will be refused for new residential development if it causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.

Parking

8. There is no access available to provide parking within the appeal site. The proposed development would therefore be reliant on on-street parking. This is provided in the vicinity of the site in a communal parking bay. I saw during my visit, which was conducted mid-morning, that the bay was full and there were limited on-street parking spaces in the wider area around the appeal site.
9. While the site is well located for access to public transport, the proposal is for a two-bedroom house and the Council's parking standards require two parking spaces for such a development. While none of the neighbouring houses have dedicated parking there is no evidence before me of when they were built, or what standards were in place for parking at that time. The site is close to public transport and the town centre, schools and other services, but it is nevertheless likely that future occupiers will own one or more cars, adding to parking demand in the area around the site. In the absence of dedicated parking provision the development would exacerbate the existing parking situation near the site. It would result in the displacement of existing parking and cause congestion from drivers seeking parking spaces, resulting in harm to the amenities of existing residents.
10. The proposed development would therefore fail to provide sufficient car parking, contrary to the requirements of Policy BAS BE12 of the LP. Amongst other criteria, this policy requires that development not cause material harm through traffic harm or congestion.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site falls within the zone of influence for the Essex Coastal Recreation Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy. Had I been minded to allow the appeal, it would have been necessary to carry out an appropriate assessment to determine whether the appeal proposal would result in a significant impact, either alone or cumulatively with other development, on protected habitats along the Essex coast. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons it is not necessary to address the matter further.

Planning Balance

12. The Council has a shortfall in its supply of deliverable housing land. The presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is therefore engaged.
13. The appeal proposal would deliver one new house. This would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The house would provide an acceptable standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposal would make use of previously developed land, for which the Framework expresses support. The site is well located for access to public transport and to the town centre, services and facilities. While the

benefits associated with a single new dwelling are small, in light of the shortfall of housing land they attract moderate weight in favour of the proposal.

14. Set against the benefits that would result from the development are the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area, as well as from the lack of dedicated parking. Cumulatively, these adverse impacts attract significant weight in the planning balance, and in this instance would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
15. There are therefore no material considerations to indicate that this appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR