



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2023

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/22/3310293

14 Norfolk Way, Canvey Island, Essex, SS8 9TJ

- 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 Mrs Hollie Farrows against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 22/0459/FUL, dated 27 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with a roof matching existing and a rear gable. Demolish existing garage and create rear parking space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension with a roof matching existing and a rear gable. Demolish existing garage and create rear parking space, at 14 Norfolk Way, Canvey Island, Essex, SS8 9TJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 22/0459/FUL, dated 27 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01 Rev E Location Plan; 02 Rev E Site Plan; 03 Rev E Existing Plans; 04 Rev E Existing Sections and Plans; 06 Rev H Proposed Plans; 07 Rev E Proposed Sections and Plans; and 08 rev H Proposed Elevations.
 - 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.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the rear parking space has been constructed in the position shown on drawing no. 02 Rev E, and thereafter shall be kept available at all times for the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants of the dwelling and their visitors and for no other purpose. Prior to its first use, this parking space shall be provided with a dropped kerb crossing onto The Firs.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form a different wording has been entered, but as the parties have not provided written confirmation that a

revised description of development has been agreed I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace dwelling located in a residential area which comprises buildings of similar style, detailing, materials and construction period. This suburban estate is characterised by its green open spaces and verges, and it is primarily these which give a sense of space to the area rather than the garden areas of the close-knit buildings. Although the Council's assessment is that end terrace dwellings are generally set on relatively generous plots and maintain good levels of isolation between flank elevations and the highway, distances are not uniform and there are examples of corner properties positioned close to their side boundaries within the wider area.
5. The dwelling is prominently sited due to its position at the junction of Norfolk Way and The Firs, a cul-de-sac to the side of the property. Front gardens in the vicinity tend to be reasonably shallow, and much of that at the appeal property is occupied by vehicle parking. Although the enclosed side garden is undeveloped, with its mix of fencing and proximity to the garage to be demolished, it makes little contribution to the setting of the dwelling. The dwelling at the opposite end of the terrace sits close to its side boundary, and there is limited space to the neighbouring terrace, creating a fairly close-knit building group typical of the streetscene.
6. The appeal property sides on to the footpath, and beyond is an open parking area of The Firs. As such there is a reasonably large gap between the appeal building and the opposite terrace which fronts The Firs. A deep verge in front of the appeal terrace adds to the sense of space at this point.
7. Amongst other criteria, Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 1998 (LP) requires the scale, siting, design, and layout of development to be appropriate to its setting, and not harmful to the character of its surroundings. This is supported by RDG2 of the Design Guidance (SPD)¹, which advises that the space around all new development should be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings, with a gap of at least 1m between properties and the boundary. However, it does note that where dwellings are located next to public open space and other areas of land² which serve as a buffer to development, less space may be considered appropriate.
8. In this context, the extension would be built close to the boundary with the footpath on the south-eastern side of The Firs, but the parking area within that side road would act as a buffer to development in accordance with RDG2. In addition, and of particular relevance, within the same vista as the appeal site there is another end-of-terrace house, 9 Fir Walk (No.9), which has been extended up to its side boundary; although not as deep as this proposal, that extension would appear to be wider than proposed in this case. A copy has not

¹ Castle Point Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2013

² SPD Paragraph 5.4.7 confirms that this can include land such as parking areas.

been supplied, but the appellant has referred to a planning permission for this development in the grounds of appeal.

9. The side boundaries of No.9 and the appeal property both abut a footpath. Although at No.9 the footpath is next to a green open space rather than a parking area, both areas have the same effect of providing a buffer to development. As the parking area creates a sense of space, it would avoid the proposal appearing over dominant or obtrusive in the street scene. I am mindful of the importance that side isolation spaces can have in streetscene terms in some locations, but given the pattern in this part of the estate a more rigid application of the guidance of RDG2 would not be necessary to maintain the character of the area. In this regard, I note that the Council does not oppose the extension on design grounds, having considered its minimalist detailing to fully reflect the style and appearance of the host property.
10. Whilst I note the Council's concern that the proposal would disrupt the building line of The Firs to the rear of the site, it would be no more disruptive to the pattern than the development built at 9 Fir Walk, which has a similar relationship to the dwellings in The Firs as the appeal property. Moreover, the rear access track between The Firs terrace and the appeal site aids in creating a visual break between the two building groups, thereby further reducing the impact of the proposal.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in its effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the wider area, and would accord with LP Policy EC2, SPD RDG2 and RDG3, which requires new development to be informed by the prevailing building lines to the public realm it faces, and to make a positive contribution to the streetscape, with a design, material, scale, roof pitch and detailing which integrate with or complement primarily the dwelling, but also those present in the surrounding streetscene. For the same reasons, the proposal would accord with the design requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, to create developments that are sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control materials to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.
13. The Council has requested a condition that requires a dropped kerb crossing to serve the parking space at the front of the site, although at the time of the appeal site visit a dropped kerb had been installed. However, a new crossover would be required to serve the rear parking space following the demolition of the garage, and with some modification to ensure the provision of the space I have attached a condition to that effect.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR