
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/17/3170896

54 Glenbervie Drive, Leigh-On-Sea, Essex SS9 3JT

- 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 Matthew Parsons against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01661/FULH was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is to erect side extension, hipped to gable roof extension, dormer and porch to front, extend rear dormer, form layout parking and vehicular access onto Glenbervie Drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Guidance in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: Design and Townscape Guide (SPD) (2009) seeks well designed and appropriately scaled elevations to both frontages for development on a corner site. In addition, the guidance seeks to ensure that additional roof accommodation respects the style, scale and form of the existing roof design and character of the wider area. Dormers should appear incidental in the roof slope and side extensions should be subservient additions.
 4. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow on a prominent corner location. The openness of this corner position makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this primarily residential area. The surrounding area comprises a mix of dwellings of various designs, including two-storey dwellings, chalet bungalows and bungalows. The adjoining property at No. 56 Glenbervie Drive is a chalet bungalow which has been extended to the side and has a large rear dormer.
 5. The proposal before me includes a side extension with a front dormer and the extension of the existing rear dormer to create one large rear dormer. I note that the proposed extensions would be of a similar scale to the extensions to
-

the adjoining property and would include a rear dormer of similar scale and design. I understand that No. 56 Glenbervie Drive was extended prior to the Council's existing SPD guidance.

6. The proposal would balance the scale and design of the pair of semi-detached properties. However, in doing so, it would create a large dominant over scaled rear dormer which would be visible from Grange Park Drive. This would not be incidental in the roof slope. In my opinion, being so close to the existing rear dormer at No. 56 Glenbervie Drive, the cumulative visual impact would exacerbate the dominance of the proposed dormer, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
7. The proposed side extension would significantly encroach into the open side garden. Due to its scale, bulk and design, I do not consider that it would appear as a subservient addition. It would dominate this open corner location, to the detriment of the open character and appearance of this part of the site within the streetscene.
8. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, particularly the similarity with the adjoining property. The appeal site is in a significantly more prominent position than No. Glenbervie Drive and I have determined the proposal on its individual merits.
9. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in SPD and contrary to Policies KP2 and CP4 in the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 in the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015), where they seek high quality design that respects existing character.
10. As the Core Strategy policies precede the National Planning Policy Framework, it is necessary for me to determine whether these policies are in accordance with the Framework. I consider that these policies referred to above are broadly in accordance with the Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR