



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2025

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/24/3354480

43 Marine Approach, Canvey Island, Essex, SS8 0DL

- 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 Scott Yeoman against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0364/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations and extensions to bungalow to form a house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was lodged a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), and further revisions, have been published. Having reviewed the changes, I am satisfied that they do not affect the substantive matters of the appeal, and that proceeding without seeking further comments from the parties would not be prejudicial to their cases.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached three-bedroom dwelling located in a residential area that is mixed in terms of the design and scale of dwellings. Plot sizes and the positioning of dwellings also varies, although a characteristic feature of the street scene is the spacing between buildings. Single-storey elements such as garages built up to side boundaries are prevalent, but for two-storey properties, there is generally a pedestrian width gap to one or both side boundaries. Some properties have a garage built up to the boundary with the room above inset from it. In this context, it is unusual to find dwellings in the vicinity with accommodation over two floors spanning the full width of the plot.
5. The existing building fills the full width of the appeal site but it is not a dominant feature in the street scene due to its modest height and hipped roof design. The recessed position of the flat-roofed garage also contributes to a sense of space. In contrast, the proposed alterations would create a far more dominant building due to the significant increase in its bulk, and the massing of the roof; the submitted street

scene indicates that it would be slightly taller than both neighbouring properties. Although I note that this is a secondary road, the proposal would nevertheless be apparent in the public domain of Marine Approach due to the relative position of buildings.

6. The increased height of the dwelling at the boundaries and the partly gable-sided form would create an unacceptably cramped appearance on the site and in the street scene. This lack of space around the building would be exacerbated by the forward extension of the current garage. This would not reflect RDG2 of the Castle Point Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), which notes that the space around all new development should be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings and should provide at least 1m between the property and boundary. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing building does not meet this standard, as noted above, this spacing is more prevalent and effective in the street scene at first-floor level.
7. As a result of the proposed side/front extension onto the current driveway, the provision of a second parking space may only be achieved by the removal of an existing lawned area and ornamental tree. Although the Council refers to the loss of the garage, its restricted size means that vehicle parking is already a feature of the front garden. The proposal would not increase bedroom numbers at the property and the parking requirement does not alter.
8. Whilst I share the Council's view that the proposal would result in a car-dominated frontage, there are other examples of fully paved front gardens in the vicinity, and it is not evident that there is any restriction that would prevent the appellant from removing the existing lawn and planting. The proposed replacement tree could be secured via a planning condition, as could additional soft landscaping. As such, I do not consider that this aspect of the proposal need detract from the site to the degree anticipated by the Council, nor conflict with the requirements in SPD RDG12 or Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Local Plan 1998 (LP), for the appearance and treatment of spaces around buildings to be enhanced by appropriate hard and soft landscaping. However, this does not alter my assessment of the extensions to the dwelling.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed extensions would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal site and the street scene, and would be contrary to the design objectives of the Framework, which include ensuring that developments are sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment; and LP Policy EC2, as supported by SPD RDG2, insofar as it seeks a high standard of design for extensions and alterations to buildings, with particular regard to scale, density, siting, design, and layout, all of which should be appropriate to its setting and not harm the character of its surroundings.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR