

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2016

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/16/3153543

87 St. Augustines Avenue, Thorpe Bay, Southend-On-Sea, SS1 3JG

- 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 Mr Ray Whittaker against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00404/FULH, dated 11 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*Garage projection extension.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At my site visit I observed that works had commenced at the property, presumably relating to the proposal given that the garage's side wall has been raised with a series of brick courses. A window has also been incorporated in the flank wall. I have not been provided with any information to show that, subsequent to this appeal being lodged, any planning permission has been granted relating to this property, and I must therefore determine this appeal purely on the evidence before me.
3. In the circumstances, despite the apparent retrospective nature of the application at appeal, I am required to treat the case as a proposal for development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property, in common with the other dwellings in this quiet residential street, is a characteristic detached bungalow with a garage attached to its flank wall. The proposal would involve pulling the garage forward of the adjoining front elevational wall by some 1.75 m and raising its height by approximately 650mm. Its flat profile would remain.
-

6. Following my site visit I walked along St Augustines Avenue and noted that the most common physical arrangement involves the side garages' overlying roofs pitching in to their respective bungalow's main roof, below ridge-line level. Indeed, this relationship is visually pleasing along the streetscene and works well for a number of properties within. However, although there are some examples of flat-roofed garages, contrary to the appellant's assertion that the proposed design reflects similar developments undertaken within the street, I did not witness any properties, save for No 82, with such an arrangement as is here proposed. The Council indicates that the extension at No 82 was approved in 1997 and I agree that, since this time, there have been material changes with respect to both policy and general guidance on design related matters.
7. Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management DPD requires that all development should add to the overall quality of the area and respect the character of the site and its local context in terms of general appearance and architectural approach. More specifically, relating to domestic extensions, the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'The Design and Townscape Guide' (SPD1) indicates that side extensions should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building and advises that, to achieve this, extensions should be set back behind the building frontage line and that the design, particularly the roof, should fully integrate with the host property.
8. The proposal, in this particular instance, is a typical case in point. Although the garage's flat roof may be original in form, its heightening, combined with it being significantly pulled forward, would compound to result in a side addition for which subordination to the bungalow itself would be lost. Indeed, the garage's raised roof, far from integrating with the main property, would make for an awkward relationship between the two elements. This would be visually detrimental to the streetscene.
9. I note the appellant's point that a pitched roof was considered but discounted due to issues of size and proportion. However, as I have mentioned, there are numerous examples of similar such arrangements working successfully along the street, and I am not convinced that all options have been explored given the appellant's stated requirement that the garage be extended to accommodate a family sized car.
10. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to the aims of Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management DPD and also the guidance contained within the SPD1.
11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR