



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2024

by J Somers BSocSci (Planning) MA (HEC) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/23/3334226

46 The Driveway, Canvey Island, SS8 0AD

- 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 Ajay Builders against the decision of Castlepoint Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0507/FUL, dated 3 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'first floor extension with front dormers & cropped roof.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the existing building and the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located along The Driveway, a residential street which like surrounding streets, appears to have been constructed as part of a larger development. The original dwellings of the housing development appear to date from the early twentieth century and comprise predominantly of small plots with detached and semi-detached dwellings. It would appear that the development was designed to be low scale, with the majority of the dwellings in the locality being single storey with similar building placement and simple functional designs with common features being hipped roof forms with chimney stacks, rendered façades with large bow windows. There are also characteristic setbacks with gaps in and around dwellings which emphasise a spaciousness with vegetated front and rear gardens, the tops of trees in rear gardens which can be seen as one travels along The Driveway. These details create positive elements which reflect the qualities of character, appearance and local distinctiveness for this particular location. Whilst there is evidence of good and poor extensions and alterations seen throughout the locality, extensions are generally subservient to the main dwelling and retain the original positive characteristics which contribute to local character and distinctiveness.
4. The appeal site appears to be one of the original characteristic detached bungalows constructed as part of the housing development and is situated between two pairs of semi-detached single storey dwellings. The appeal dwelling has a functional design with main hipped roof and large single storey extension to the rear. Whilst I did see a range of dwelling types and extensions

which have occurred over time that has changed the appearance of some dwellings, I did not feel that the character of dwellings was as 'varied' as suggested in the Appellant's Statement of Case (SoC). The appeal building does contribute towards positive characteristics reinforcing the original design elements of a largely homogenous group of low scale buildings of the greater housing development and the general character of this section of The Driveway.

5. In undertaking extensions and alterations to existing buildings, the Castlepoint Local Plan (LP) Policy EC2 seeks to ensure that development responds to and reinforces and enhances the positive aspects of the locality, such as scale, density, design, layout and external materials, amongst others. Additionally, the Castlepoint Residential Design Guide (RDG) supports this policy and gives further guidance on the considerations needed to guide appropriate extensions to properties. Elements of the RDG which are relevant are that roof design should be compatible with the dwelling and be informed by the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of roof development, and it should be proportionate to the remainder of the dwelling and not be top heavy or appear prominent or dominant, amongst others.
6. The extension would elongate the roof form of the existing dwelling into a two storey dwelling, with the roof forming an almost cat-slide type appearance to the street. The roof form itself is large and quite top-heavy with large half-hipped rooves to either side and would have an awkward and disproportionate appearance which is overcomplicated for a functionally designed dwelling. Additionally, the two large dormers are very wide and have large protrusions from the roof and have a large and domineering appearance that adds further clutter to a roof form which is already overcomplicated.
7. I note examples in the Appellant's SoC in the locality of approved applications for increasing roof height and extensions to dwellings¹. Whilst I have not been presented with the circumstances and considerations behind these schemes, No.s 26 and 55 are for rear roof dormers that do not increase the height of the roof in the manor proposed in this application, and No.s 36 and 38 appear to have been developed in part of the street scene that does not appear as homogenous as the component of the street where the appeal site lies. There are clearly some dwellings that reinforce the characteristics of the street scene in a better way than others. I am therefore not convinced that the circumstances behind or the approval of these schemes are similar and would provide justification for the appropriateness of the appeal scheme.
8. I also appreciate explanation and attempts around reducing visual bulk such as proposing a half-hipped roof; however this is unsuccessful. The proposal with its increased massing, scale and elongated roof form and dormers would not embrace the positive characteristics of the locality and would appear quite cramped within the plot. Whilst I appreciate that the overall ground floor footprint is unchanged, the proposed roof extension would change the proportions of the roof and result in an awkward and elongated and bulky appearance that would be disproportionate and affect the architectural integrity and authenticity of this functional building.

¹ Council Planning Reference: CPT/194/12/FUL, 36 The Driveway; 21/0003/FUL, 38 The Driveway; 21/1088/CLP, 55 The Driveway; 21/0160/CLP 26 The Driveway.

9. Taken as a whole, and in conclusion of this matter, in this particular circumstance, the proposed roof extensions would be incongruous in this location as a result of design, massing and visual bulk, and not reflective of the positive characteristics of local distinctiveness and appearance of the area. The development would cause an incongruous element within the street scene which would cause detriment to the functional architectural authenticity of the existing dwelling and of the street scene. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the LP Policy EC2 which is supported by the RDG as described previously.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Somers

INSPECTOR