

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3330521

27 Broome Road, Billericay, Essex CM11 1ES

- 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 James Stacey against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00720/FULL, dated 30 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage, part two storey and part single storey front and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed roof plan on drawing ref 2974/02E appears to show the front two storey extension with a hipped roof, while the elevations show a gable end. As the main parties' appeal submissions refer to a gable, I have dealt with the appeal proposal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two storey front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. No 27 is a detached two storey dwelling in a residential road of similar property types. Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) states that permission for the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if the development causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.
5. Comparisons are drawn between the appeal proposal and a previous unsuccessful one for similar extensions¹. While I note this, I have considered the proposal before me on its individual merits.

¹ Ref 22/01546/FULL.

6. The appeal property displays a regular plan form with a detached garage to its frontage, offset to one side and of subordinate height to the host dwelling. It is part of a group with dwellings to the north-east that share the same front building line and, in the case of No 31, the same design and layout as No 27, with a detached garage to the road frontage. Dwellings to the south-west, starting with No 25 next to the appeal property, are also on a consistent front building line, which is substantially further forward than No 27 and its neighbours to the north-east. Consequently, properties on this side of Broome Road appear as two distinct groups.
7. The proposal involves replacing the garage with a two storey extension adjoining the existing dwelling. It would be marginally closer to the road frontage than the garage and while its roof ridge would be below that of the original dwelling, it would nonetheless add significant bulk due to its height and substantive projection forward of the existing two storey built form.
8. The effects of this would be seen approaching the property from the north-east and closer to it due to the gap between Nos 27 and 29. From these views the uncharacteristic extent of the two storey depth of the whole dwelling would be apparent, which would result from the bulk and additional depth of the front extension. This would reduce the openness of the property's frontage compared to the neighbouring dwellings to the north-east and would obscure views of the dwellings to the south-west. Moreover, it would harmfully undermine the planned layout and design of the street scene, including the uniformity that currently exists between Nos 27 and 31. As such, the front extension would appear as an uncharacteristic and dominant feature which would be harmful within the street scene.
9. The appellants contend that the existing front elevation has a blank appearance due to the lack of articulation and the small window. However, it does not follow that the current proposal is the only means of addressing any such concerns and the need to provide more living space. Prominent front gables on other properties, such as No 18 or 29, appear to be part of the original design of the dwelling and these do not have the same effects as the appeal proposal would in its particular setting in the street scene. The fact that there were no objections to the proposal from neighbouring occupiers or other interested parties cannot overcome the above findings.
10. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed two storey front extension would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR