



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/25/3362774

34 Westerland Avenue, Canvey Island, ESSEX SS8 8JX

- 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 and Mrs Maher against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0729/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension, two storey front/side extension, first floor extension and external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the Council's decision notice although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issue

3. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

4. RDG7 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that the roof design of any development should be compatible primarily with the dwelling and also the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of roof development. RDG8 of the Guidance seeks consistency to protect the design and architectural approaches, and the visual appearance of developments, to ensure that additions or alterations do not result in prominent, dominant, alien, or incongruous features which detract from the appearance of the host dwelling or the public realm.
5. The two storey front gable feature, given its large size and projection, would not assimilate with the existing architectural design approach of the dwelling. The use of different finishing materials that are not complementary would add to the appearance of the projection being of an out of keeping design. The forward gable-fronted projection with its prominent and incongruous design would not be sympathetic to the architectural character of the host dwelling. As such, the proposed development would not integrate with the existing architectural style of the dwelling and would create a feature of discordant visual appearance that would detract from the character of the property.

6. I saw that this is a detached property that has an individual architectural style within the street scape. Images of properties within Westerland Avenue have been provided that illustrate gable fronted elements to be a feature of the wider street scene, including that of No. 37 Westerland Avenue. I accept this to be the case. Nonetheless, I have not been directed to any projecting front gables of a similar design and to a dwelling of a consistent architectural approach to that of the appeal dwelling within the wider street scene. Furthermore, the front two-storey projecting gable would be substantially more prominent than any of the others I saw within the street scene or that of the other examples that I have been directed to.
7. The Appellant suggests that a more acceptable palette of materials could potentially be agreed. Whether or not other materials would be considered more acceptable, this would not overcome the incongruous form of the development itself. As such, alternative materials would not ameliorate the objections sufficiently to allow permission to be granted.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan 1998 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). That policy and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high standard of design that is appropriate for its setting.
9. Furthermore, the proposed change in roof form would be inconsistent with the principles outlined in RDG7 of the SPD that emphasises the importance of ensuring roof alterations harmonise with the existing dwelling. The proposed design would fail to achieve this as it would visually contrast to that of the existing dwelling. The design approach would also conflict with RDG8 of the SPD that seeks to promote architectural coherence to ensure that new developments respect the character of the host property.

Other Matters

10. The proposal seeks to extend and refurbish the existing property utilising as much of the existing property as possible and allowing for an improvement in layout and room sizes to create a more functional family home. The space on the first floor would provide for an additional bathroom that again would benefit the family's use of the property. Whilst these are merits of the proposed development, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above or justify the proposal.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR