

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/22/3291266
17 St Annes Road, Canvey Island, SS8 7LS

- 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 John Saville against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0986/FUL, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of extensions to the ground and first floor to the principal elevation to provide larger accommodation and en-suite.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of extensions to the ground and first floor to the principal elevation to provide larger accommodation and en-suite at 17 St Annes Road, Canvey Island, SS8 7LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0986/FUL, dated 20 October 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 21-030-001, 21-030-002, 21-030-010, 21-030-020, 21-030-3100, and 21-030-110.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The Council identified the two main issues as design and parking. They raised no concern regarding the proposal's design or appearance. I have no reason to take a different view. The main issue in this appeal is therefore the effect of the proposal on highway safety and amenity in the neighbourhood having regard to parking.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached three-bed house. It has a reasonably shallow frontage that is hard-surfaced and open to the pavement. At the time of my visit a car was parked on the site in front of the dwelling and parallel to the road, accessed via a pavement crossover to the right-hand side of the site. I am told that the Council's adopted parking standards seek parking bays to measure 2.9m wide by 5m deep. At a frontage depth of 4m, according to a figure given by the Council, there is insufficient space to accommodate a second off-street parking space at the appeal site. By providing just one off-street parking space the existing situation at No 17 falls short of the Council's normal parking requirement of two off-street spaces for a property of two or more bedrooms.
4. The proposal would extend part of the property slightly forward. As a consequence, the depth of the forecourt at this point would reduce from 4m to 3.3m. This would have no effect on the current parking arrangement for a single car, which would still be able to park parallel to the road. There would be no loss of any existing parking or interference with access to the existing space.
5. The Council argue that the proposal would increase pressure for parking. I accept that any attempt to park a second car at right angles to the road would result in it overhanging the pavement. However, that scenario is unlikely. The overhang would be severe and, moreover, there is no evidence of the forecourt area being used to park a car inappropriately in this manner at present.
6. The proposed plans show that an existing ground floor reception room would become a bedroom/reception room with an en-suite facility as a result of the extension. Technically the property would have four bedrooms, but this would be achieved principally through internal changes. The size of the additional floorspace that is proposed would be minimal. It would not in itself create space for an additional bedroom. In any event, I have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that the Council's adopted parking standards would require additional off-street parking for an increase from a three-bedroom to a four-bedroom property.
7. Based on the information I have, the circumstances are that the existing dwelling has parking provision that is one space below the Council's normal standard. The extension would result in a slightly larger dwelling but one that would equally have parking provision that would be one space below the normal standard. There is nothing about the proposed extension that would result in additional parking demand. It follows that there would be no additional on-street parking and no impact upon the safety or free flow of traffic along St Annes Road, or any impact upon the residential amenity of the area. Consequently, I can detect no conflict with the aims and objectives of the Council's Residential Design Guidance as it relates to parking and access, or with Policy EC2 of the Local Plan 1998 as it relates to safe and convenient modes of movement. The proposal would not increase the need for parking provision on the site and therefore there would be no conflict with parking standards that are required by Local Plan Policy T8. For these same reasons

there would be no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

8. I have noted some other matters that have been raised by nearby residents. The proposed extension would not encroach beyond the existing forwardmost part of the dwelling. The absence of any direct access to the rear garden of the property has no relevance to the planning merits of the proposal that is before me. The proposal is for reasonably minor works that would be short term and unlikely to have any significant impact due to noise or disruption.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit condition a condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to ensure that the materials used externally match those on the existing building.

Conclusion

10. In the absence of any identified conflict with the development plan, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR