
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/W/17/3171219

2A Lymington Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2AU

- 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 Bryant against the decision of Southend-on-sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02036/FULH, dated 9 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a '*retrospective application for the installation of weather boarding to the front, rear and side elevations of the dwelling*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of weather boarding to the front, rear and side elevations of the dwelling at 2A Lymington Avenue, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2AU, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/02036/FULH, dated 9 November 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. Although the application form refers to the site as 2 Lymington Avenue, this is the address of the next house down the street, which I noted at my site visit. The appeal form correctly refers to the appeal site as No 2A, and I have made my decision, accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling situated in a residential street predominantly characterised by pairs of late Victorian/Edwardian dwellings. No 2A appears to have been built at some later date and, save for a roughly common building line with the neighbouring dwellings on the east side of the street; it bears little relationship in style or design to the local vernacular.
5. The dwelling was recently insulated and then clad over with grey and white weatherboarding. I have been provided with photographs to show the external condition of the dwelling prior to the works being carried out and it would appear that the building was then in some need of attention.

6. The Council indicates that as false timber cladding does not appear within the vicinity of the site, the use of such material is incongruous and out of character with the surrounding area. However, as I have indicated, the form and design of the dwelling is not itself characteristic of its surroundings. As such, the advice given in paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that development should promote or reinforce local distinctiveness is not easily achievable in instances such as this. Further, having seen the photographs of the building before the works were undertaken, I am satisfied that the external treatment, which gives a modern feel to the property, represents an improvement in the dwelling's appearance.
7. I have had regard to the representations made by interested parties in response to the development. One objector dislikes the works that have been carried out preferring, instead, the dwelling's previous appearance of white render. Photographs of other properties in the locality are provided showing examples of render which the objector considers preferable. However, this is a matter of personal taste.
8. Various grounds of objection have been raised; the majority of which, such as encroachment, constitute civil matters between the neighbours involved and these are not material to the planning issues arising.
9. An objector also cites the wording relating to a condition often imposed on planning permissions for domestic extensions which requires that the materials used in the development matches that of the host building. I do not consider that such a requirement is applicable in this instance as planning permission is here sought for the entire dwelling's re-cladding. This has given the dwelling a new and different appearance but one that I find is visually acceptable in the street scene.
10. I conclude that the proposal is not harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or its surrounding area. I also find no material conflict with the design objectives of Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend Core Strategy, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend Management Document or relevant advice contained in either the Southend Design and Townscape Guide or the Framework.
11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR