



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 March 2024

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/23/3329340

53 Waarem Avenue, Canvey Island, Essex SS8 9DZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jeff Edney against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/0307/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a front/side extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front/side extension with internal alterations at 53 Waarem Avenue, Canvey Island, Essex SS8 9DZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/0307/FUL, and 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: 03 and 04A.
 - 3) No development shall take place above ground floor slab level until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) The ground floor level within the extension hereby permitted shall be set no lower than the finished ground floor level within the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Government published a recently revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). However, there are no material changes relevant to the substance of this appeal. Therefore, I am satisfied that no one will be prejudiced by the changes to the national policy context. References to the Framework in this decision relate to the revised document.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Development in the area of the appeal site consists of rows of residential buildings comprising bungalows, chalet bungalows and houses of different designs, proportions, sizes and materials. Although the buildings front onto the roads in a grid-like pattern, their facades are mostly set back from the roads by different distances giving a noticeably stepped appearance to the building lines.
5. Whilst the 2 storey appeal building is taller than the low height bungalows on the opposite corners of the crossroads junction, it is comparable in scale to several 2 storey buildings in the street scene. Furthermore, the appeal building is set relatively close to the roads at the corner of the junction and behind brick walls, where the narrow space between it and the roads does not contribute to any strong sense of spaciousness in the street scene. In these respects, development in the area of the appeal site has a mixed pattern with little uniformity and it does not follow a strong linear building line.
6. The proposed extension would add bulk to the façade of the appeal building facing Thelma Avenue, particularly at an elevated level. However, the height, width and depth of the proposed extension would be proportionate to the scale of the appeal building. The gabled form of the proposal would reflect not only the architectural style of the host building, but the front projecting gables of several existing dwellings in the mixed street scene.
7. The modest forward projection of the proposed extension would respect the stepped building line, which comprises dwellings of mixed scales and appearances, and its massing would not be dominant or intrusive. As such, it would not conflict with the guidance in RDG3 of the Castle Point Borough Council Residential Design Guidance, 2013, (RDG), which states that distinctive patterns of development which create an exceptionally strong building line should not be disrupted. The blankness of the relatively narrow south facing wall of the proposed extension would not be visually oppressive when seen with the existing south facing first floor window.
8. For these reasons, the proposed extension would be satisfactorily absorbed into the rows of buildings of mixed scales and appearances in the street scene, where it would contribute to reinforcing the established variety of buildings in the area.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be consistent with Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan, Adopted 1998, which seeks to ensure that extensions to buildings achieve a high standard of design, and are not harmful to the character of its surroundings. It would also be consistent with the guidance in the RDG, which requires development to integrate with or complement the host dwelling and those in the surrounding street scene.
10. For the same reasons, the proposal would be consistent with Framework Paragraph 135, which states that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

11. Although the proposed extension would be visible from the crossroads junction above the existing ground floor wing of the appeal building, it would not obstruct the ability of pedestrians, drivers or other road users, from being able to see each other when crossing or using the nearby roads. Therefore, I am satisfied on the evidence before me that the appeal proposal would not unacceptably increase the risk of accidents or harm highway safety in this location.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the relevant tests in the Framework and where necessary I have amended the wording of the suggested conditions to ensure compliance with the tests. In the interests of certainty of the planning permission granted, conditions are imposed to necessarily indicate the time limit for implementation and specify the approved plans.
13. Horizontal boarding was not present on the appeal property at my site visit and its proposed use would conflict with the Council's suggested condition for matching materials. For certainty, and to ensure that the development respects the appearance of the host property, it is necessary to impose a condition requiring details of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the proposed development to be approved by the Council.
14. To ensure that the proposed extension would be no more vulnerable to the ingress of flood water than the existing building, it is necessary to impose a condition controlling the internal ground floor level.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR