

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Alex Hutson MATP CMLI MArborA

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

Decision date: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/16/3162770
6 Chadwick Road, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 8LS

- 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 James Fisher against the decision of Southend-on-sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01354/FULH, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension, extend existing porch, install balconies to first floor front and second floor rear and Juliette balcony to first floor rear, alter roof form to include accommodation in roof with dormer to rear, roof flights to rear and side elevations and alter elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erect part single/part two storey side and rear extension, extend existing porch, install balconies to first floor front and second floor rear and Juliette balcony to first floor rear, alter roof form to include accommodation in roof with dormer to rear, roof flights to rear and side elevations and alter elevations at 6 Chadwick Road, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 8LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01354/FULH, dated 18 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision; and
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 639 010 Rev B; and 639 011 Rev J.

Preliminary matters

2. I have taken the description of the proposal from the Council's decision notice as this provides a more accurate description than that provided on the application form.
 3. The majority of the proposal has been built in accordance with the submitted plans. Where necessary, I refer to this in the present tense. However, the Council has identified an inconsistency between the front porch as built and this element of the proposal as shown on the submitted plans. I observed from my site visit that the front porch as built includes a small canopy which is not shown on the submitted plans, albeit an annotation indicates that this is intended. Thus, for the avoidance of doubt I have determined the appeal on
-

the basis of the submitted plans though with the benefit of an external inspection.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Chadwick Road is residential in character. Dwellings along Chadwick Road typically comprise large, detached, two storey properties of a traditional appearance. However, they also display a variety of architectural styles and roof forms which provides a strong level of diversity within the streetscene.
6. The appeal property, which also has a traditional appearance, is a two storey, detached dwelling. It has two front facing gables, one of which projects forward over a two storey bay projection. The Council's main concerns relate, firstly, to the junction of the first floor bay projection where it meets the eaves of the forward projecting gable above this element, as built and as shown on the submitted plans; and secondly, to the height of the windows within both front facing gables, as built and as shown on the submitted plans.
7. In respect of the Council's first concern, I recognise that the form of the junction is box-like in shape. I also acknowledge that it might not appear as recessive a design feature as the stepped junction consented under Ref 15/01025/FULH. Nevertheless, in the context of the diverse architectural variety which exists along Chadwick Road, I do not consider that this element of the development appears visually obtrusive. Moreover, the colour of this element, which reflects the general colour of the appeal property, assists with reducing its overall prominence. This is notwithstanding the presence of some gallow brackets beneath it.
8. Turning to the Council's second concern, I observed that there is no particular consistency between the height, width or size of windows within front facing gables of dwellings along Chadwick Road where these features exist. The windows within the front facing gables of the appeal property are centrally sited and their shape reflects the slope of the roof. In addition, their size and height maintains an appropriate window hierarchy within the front elevation of the appeal property. Whilst there is a gap between the top of these windows and the fascia of the front facing gables, this is also true of other such windows within dwellings along Chadwick Road, including the adjacent property, No 4. I therefore consider that these windows are appropriately proportioned and do not appear out of place.
9. The Council raises no particular concerns in respect of the remainder of the proposal, including the front porch element. On the basis of the evidence before me and my own observations, I have no substantive reasons to consider otherwise.
10. I therefore conclude that the development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore comply with Policies KP2- Development Principles and CP4- The Environment and Urban Renaissance, of the Southend-on-sea Core Strategy Development Plan Document One 2007; and Policy DM1- Design Quality, of the Southend-on-sea Development Management Document 2015. These policies require, amongst

other things, development to create a sense of place, to respect the character and scale of existing neighbourhoods and respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings.

Conditions

11. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. In addition to the statutory time limit condition, a condition specifying the relevant drawings is necessary as this provides certainty.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR