



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2023

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/22/3307529
55 Glebe Road, Wickford, Essex SS11 8ET

- 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 Mark Butterworth against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00842/FULL, dated 7 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey garage and rear summer house, new side and rear extensions to form 2 new bedrooms at 1st floor and a new kitchen dining area at ground floor with new entrance hall and bathroom extension and 1st floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 55 Glebe Road (No 55) is a two storey semi-detached dwelling occupying a corner plot at the junction of Glebe Road with Rectory Grove. No 55 lies within an established residential area of two storey houses and bungalows with pitched roofs, many incorporating dormers, set back on roughly consistent building lines behind moderately sized front gardens.
4. Glebe Road and Rectory Grove have grass verges containing occasional street trees and boundaries around the front gardens are generally of modest height. Together these features provide a spacious feel, and this is a positive characteristic of the area.
5. No 55 is predominantly two storeys in height, with a single storey side element and a prominent rear dormer window. The plot also contains a detached garage, with a summer house behind, close to the boundary with Rectory Grove. These both have shallow pitched roofs.
6. The existing single storey element, detached garage and summer house would be replaced with a two storey side extension. There would be a single storey element projecting to the rear, close to the boundary with Rectory Grove and roughly in the position of the summer house.
7. The new part of the dwelling would extend the frontage of the pair of semi-detached dwellings, resulting in an unbalanced appearance.

8. It would extend towards Rectory Grove forward of the overall frontage line of dwellings on Rectory Grove either side of the junction. In doing so it would close down the openness of the area around the junction. This would be exacerbated by the projection of the single storey rear extension with its higher pitched roof running alongside the boundary.
9. The rear roof of the main part of the dwelling would be composed of several elements, including a crown roof. This would result in a complex, bulky roof form, in contrast to the simpler roof forms prevalent in the area.
10. In summary, the proposal would result in an incongruous built form, out-of-keeping with the area and reduce the openness of the neighbourhood, which I have identified above as an important positive characteristic. This incongruity and reduction in openness would constitute material harm, and this harm would be readily apparent to anyone travelling along Rectory Grove and to residents of the area.
11. Whilst No 55 currently has a bulky rear dormer, which is highly visible from the street, and which is, of itself, an incongruous feature in the roofscape, the benefit of its removal would be outweighed by the harm which I have identified.
12. The appellant argues that the design steps the front elevation and the ridge height, seeking to reduce the bulk of the extension, and retain subservience to the main dwelling. Notwithstanding these elements, the overall mass of the proposed extension and complex roof form would have a harmful effect on the street scene.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) which seeks to ensure that new residential development, including extensions of existing dwellings does not harm the character of the surrounding area.
14. For similar reasons the proposal would also be contrary to the aims of Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), with which the aims of the above policy closely correspond.

Other Matters

15. The appellant refers to the way in which the Council dealt with his application, however, that is a matter between the appellant and the Council.

Conclusion

16. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal fails.

I A Dyer

INSPECTOR