
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 July 2025

by **A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/25/3365404

9 Mount View, Billericay, Essex CM11 1HB

- 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 & Mrs Anthony and Siobhan Crossby against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00095/FULL.
 - The development proposed is described as: Proposed three storey side and rear extension with balcony and new retaining wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is a 3 storey dwelling on a corner plot and is of similar design to the other dwellings on this side of the road. With the elevational changes in ground level the existing dwelling is 2 storeys at the rear, though the rear garden sits significantly above the adjacent road level. To the side of the dwelling there is a side grassed area between the dwelling/retaining wall and public highway.
4. The proposed extension's front elevation does have a level of subservience to the existing dwelling by virtue of the lower ridge height and use of the balcony. In addition, the design of the front elevation is a contemporary design with architectural merit. The proposed side elevation adds a substantial amount of mass adjacent and projecting towards the public realm, though this is reduced in part by the feature windows. The rear projecting extension has less architectural merit and given its scale in the prominent position on the corner would detract from the existing dwelling. Its overall dominance would be significantly noticeable when travelling down The Mount.
5. The appellant has put forward that the proposal would be extended to line up broadly with the side gable of No. 8 Mount View (No.8). However, No.8 is on both lower ground and is two storey on the front elevation and two and a half to three storey on the side elevation. Therefore, No.8 has noticeably less impact on the current street scene and significantly less than the proposal. On this basis, only limited weight in favour of the proposal is granted on the grounds of it seeking to match the building line of No.8.

6. It is accepted that 4 The Mount (No.4) has had substantial changes made to its front elevation. However, these are of a high architectural quality that positively contribute to the street scene. In addition, the changes made minimised the overall scale alterations of the existing dwelling when viewed from the street. No.4 weighs in favour of the architectural mix of the street scene, though does not weigh in favour of placing substantial amount of mass adjacent to the public highway.
7. The example of 46 Stock Road is not on an adjacent street to this proposal. However, from the information before me the Council accepted the replacement of a more traditional style two storey dwelling with two contemporary two and a half storey dwellings; with the main reason of dispute at appeal being limited to garden sizes. This example weighs in favour of the proposal.
8. However, the proposed appeal development by virtue of a significant amount of mass projecting towards the public highway and the rear projecting element would overall significantly harm the character of street and the rear element would architecturally detract from the existing dwelling. This harm could not be made acceptable for instance by way of a landscaping or materials condition.
9. I, therefore, conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the local area and to the existing dwelling. On this basis the proposal does not comply with Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, which seeks alternations and extensions do not harm the character of the street scene. This is supported by the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

A Phillips

INSPECTOR