



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2024

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3322381

Kozecot, Southbourne Grove, Wickford, Essex SS12 0JT

- 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 & Mrs Durrant against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01006/FULL, dated 11 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is proposed raised roof with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the proposed raised roof with rear dormer at Kozecot, Southbourne Grove, Wickford, Essex SS12 0JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01006/FULL, dated 11 July 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: ADP435EP 02 Rev B and ADP435EP 03 Rev D.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published by the Government on 19 December and updated on 20 December 2023 and accompanied by a written ministerial statement (WMS). Any references to the Framework hereafter in this decision are to the latest version.
3. The revised Framework is a material consideration which should be taken into account from the day of publication. I have familiarised myself with the content of the revised Framework and the accompanying WMS and none of the revisions to the Framework would be material to this appeal. Having considered the revisions and in light of the principles of natural justice, in this instance I do not consider it necessary to invite any submissions from the parties on the revised Framework.
4. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. The Framework confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The identified fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their

openness and their permanence. The Council consider that the proposal would not represent a disproportionate addition to the host property nor compromise the openness of the Green Belt. Based on the plans before me and my observations on site I see no reason to take a different view. Accordingly, the proposal is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt and does not conflict with policy as set out in the Framework on this matter.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. The appeal site is a detached chalet style bungalow located on a corner plot at the junction of Southbourne Grove and Branksome Avenue in Wickford. The surrounding area is relatively open with the appeal site forming part of a small, secluded cluster of development, consisting of mainly low-level detached properties located in spacious plots. There are several chalet style bungalow properties that have been extended to provide living accommodation in the roof space, however they retain the low building level and low-density character of this area.
7. The proposal seeks a modest increase to the ridge height of the subordinate integral double garage roof and provide a rear roof dormer. Whilst the proposal would create visual bulk at the roof level, there would be only minor alterations to the ridge height. Furthermore, given that the dormer would be positioned to the rear of the site it would limit public views to glimpse views, via Branksome Avenue only. Whilst providing additional accommodation in the roof space, the height, scale and visual impact of the proposal from the street scene would still resemble the lower level buildings in the area. Consequently, the proposal would be akin to the architectural form of the cluster of chalet style bungalows within the vicinity.
8. From my site observations there is a prevalence of other properties that have extended into the roof slope, most notably at Oak Cottage and Barholme on Branksome Avenue to the rear of the appeal site. Whilst these properties have created additional accommodation in the roof space, these additions are proportional to the main dwelling and still maintain the low building level and low-density feel to the character of the area. Given this treatment, the appeal proposal has been sympathetically designed to minimise its impact and would appear similar to others in the area. As a result, the appeal proposal would not seem jarring, appearing as a coherent built form in the vicinity.
9. Overall, I would conclude that the height and scale of the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the immediate area. As such, the proposal would accord with the relevant provisions of Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007 which amongst other things, seeks to prevent alterations and extensions to residential development from harming the character of the surrounding area including the street scene. In this respect the proposal would also accord with the provisions of the Framework which amongst other things, also seeks to secure high quality design which protects local character.

Conditions

10. To meet legislative requirements, a condition is imposed to address the period for commencement. A condition is imposed to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure that materials match the existing property and protect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Robert Naylor

INSPECTOR