
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/17/3170880

216 Eastwood Old Road, Leigh-On-Sea, Essex SS9 4SQ

- 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 Martin Rose against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02050/FULH was refused by notice dated 6 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey side/rear extension, hip to gable extension, and addition of dormer windows to the front and rear elevations of 216 Eastwood Old Road, to provide additional accommodation.
-

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. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow on a prominent corner position. It currently includes an unauthorised single-storey wrap-around side and part rear extension. I have been made aware of the Enforcement Notice issued on 13 April 2017, Ref APP/D1590/C/17/3159628, regarding the removal of this extension.
 4. The proposal before me differs from the unauthorised extension primarily by a reduction in width to the side boundary by 0.8 metres and by the provision of a flat roof without parapets. This would be some 325mm below the existing parapet height. In addition, I note that there would be a re-instatement of a close boarded side timber fence.
 5. 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.
 6. From my observations, I consider that the proposed side extension would not integrate satisfactorily with the existing dwelling. In particular, the flat roof form would not sit comfortably with the existing dwelling and the position of the main entrance emphasises the lack of integration.
-

7. In such a prominent location, I consider that the proposed set in of the development by some 0.8 metres, the proposed off-white render and the reinstatement of a side boundary fence would have limited impact on the material visual harm of the proposal. It would appear as an unacceptably discordant addition, not in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.
8. The proposal includes alterations to the roof to provide first floor accommodation. These include front and rear dormers to match those on the adjoining dwelling. The Council has not raised concern regarding this aspect of the proposal. From my observations, whilst the character and appearance of the existing dwelling would be unbalanced, I consider that the roof alterations would balance the pair of semi-detached properties which would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I am not able to issue a split decision in this respect as there is no ground floor external wall in the rear corner due to the existence of the existing single-storey wrap around extension.
9. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, 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