

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2017

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/17/3174422

49 Southsea Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex SS9 2AX

- 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 Miss Gemma Hayward against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02141/FULH, dated 25 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormer window to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 49 Southsea Avenue (No 49) and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The development would involve the construction of a roof level extension to the rear of No 49, a semi-detached house with a part single and part two storey rear extension.
 4. The roof extension would be constructed above the existing two storey extension and No 49's two storey outrigger. The extension's flat roof form would leave the rear of No 49 with the appearance of being a three storey, flat roofed property, with only a very small part of the original outrigger's roof being retained. I consider that the roof extension would not be a subservient addition to No 49 and it would have a very poor appearance, given the extent of its flat roof and its bulk. I therefore consider that the extension would be of an unacceptable design that would be harmful to No 49's character and appearance. The external materials and window pattern would not address the extension's poor design.
 5. Comparisons have been drawn between the extension and the rear dormers at 45 Southsea Avenue (No 45) and 70 Glendale Gardens (No 70). However, while Nos 45's and 70's dormers are flat roofed additions, those dormers have been inserted into the main rear roof slopes of their respective host properties. I therefore consider that the scale and form of the dormer extensions at Nos 45 and 70 are not comparable with the proposed roof extension. Comparisons have also been drawn between the proposed extension and the flat roof additions at 45 and 56 Glendale Gardens.
-

However, no details of the planning history for the extensions at 45 and 56 Glendale Gardens have been provided and I therefore do not know the circumstances that gave rise to those developments. I am, however, required to consider the appeal development on its individual merits and that is what I have done.

6. While the roof extension would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 49, it would be quite discretely located and it would therefore have very limited visibility in the streetscene. I therefore consider that this extension would not be harmful to the wider streetscene's appearance.
7. For the reasons given above I conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 49. The development would therefore be in conflict with Policy CP4 of the Southend on Sea Core Strategy of 2007, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend on Sea Development Management Document of 2015, section 7 (Requiring good design) of the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document No 1 of 2009. That is because the development's design would not be of a good quality and the extension would be poorly related to No 49 in terms of its form and proportions and it would not be a subservient addition.
8. While conflict with Policy KP2 of the Core Strategy has been cited I find that this policy is of limited relevance because it addresses strategic level design and location considerations.

Other Matter

9. I accept that the extension's scale and siting would mean that it would have no adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, that matter is outweighed by the harm the extension would cause to No 49's character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR