

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2017

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/16/3164605

32 Park Avenue, Eastwood SS9 5XB

- 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 William Sales against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01522/FUL was refused by notice dated 11 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an elderly/disabled annex to the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of an elderly/disabled annex to the existing property, at 32 Park Avenue, Eastwood SS9 5XB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/01522/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 01, 02, 03, 04 and 05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The annex hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling at 32 Park Avenue.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene and locality.

Reasons

3. Southend on Sea Core Strategy (CS) Policy CP4 indicates that development proposals will be expected to contribute to the creation of a high quality urban environment which enhances and complements the natural and built assets of Southend. One of the ways of achieving this will be by respecting the scale and nature of existing development. The development principles of CS Policy KP2 include respecting the character and scale of the neighbourhood.
-

4. Development Management Document (DMD) Policy DM1, among other things, intends that development should add to the overall quality of the area and respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings in terms of matters such as size and scale. The aims of DMD Policy DM3 include additions making a positive contribution to the character of the original building and surrounding area. The means of achieving this include the use of materials and detailing that draw reference from the original building and ensure successful integration with it. Additions should also adopt a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and surrounding area.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD) design and townscape Guide advises that side extensions can easily become overbearing and dominate the original property. To avoid this they should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building. It is indicated that this can generally be achieved by the extension being set-back behind the existing building frontage line and that its design, in particular the roof, is fully integrated with the existing property.
6. The appeal concerns a detached bungalow with accommodation in the roof. The proposed annex would take the form of a side extension with a fairly small link to the host dwelling. The main roof would have hipped ends and a hipped front projection. These would reflect the form and pitch of the hips to the front and rear of the host building. The annex would also have the same eaves level. Bedroom 2 in the annex would have a box window similar to that serving the existing dining room. A condition could be imposed to ensure that the facing materials of the development match those of the existing building. As a result of these fairly strong references, I consider that the addition would be successfully integrated with the host dwelling.
7. It is clear from the submitted plans that the footprint of the proposed extension would be less than that of the existing property. The top of the roof would also be at a noticeably lower level. The front would be set-back from that of the host dwelling, as advised in the SPD. The extent of this dimension would be particularly generous, giving an especially strong sense of subordination to the parent building. The extension itself would have a set-back at the front, further limiting the perceived size and scale. There would also be a set-back from the host dwelling at the rear.
8. In these circumstances, the size, footprint and scale of the addition would not be excessive. Rather than appearing overly dominant and disproportionate, the development, given its lesser height, size and scale, together with the set-backs, would be respectful and subservient to the host dwelling.
9. Park Avenue in the vicinity of no. 32 is characterised by detached and semi-detached bungalows with a fairly consistent building line. Because of their significantly greater size, the overall width and footprint of the pairs of semis tend to be appreciably larger than those of the detached properties. The detached dwellings also differ noticeably in their size.
10. As a result, there is no significant consistency of footprint or width. In any event, no. 32 is located at the end of the line of frontage dwellings and the annex would not be prominent in the streetscene due to this position and the set-back from the host dwelling and building line. It would also have a particularly large school building fairly near on the opposite side to the host dwelling.

11. In consequence, I am not persuaded that the width and footprint of the annex would be sufficiently large to result in any detrimental effect in relation to the grain of development in Park Avenue. Moreover, because of the above factors it would be subservient and respectful in relation to the surrounding area.
12. For these reasons, it is concluded that there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, streetscene and locality. The development would be of a suitably high quality, with the articulated form of the annex adding visual interest. It would enhance and complement the built environment, while respecting the scale and character of the neighbourhood and the site. There would be compliance with the relevant aims of CS Policies CP4 and KP2, DMD Policies DM1 and DM3, as well as the SPD.
13. The core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework that planning should seek to secure high quality design and take account of the character of different areas would also be satisfied.
14. Taking account of all other matters raised, there is no reason to reject the proposal given the absence of harm that would result and the appeal succeeds.
15. As well as that referred to above concerning materials, a condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. For the avoidance of doubt, a condition should be imposed restricting the occupation of the annex to purposes ancillary to the use of the attached dwelling.

M Evans

INSPECTOR