
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/17/3179896

42 Crossfield Road, Southend-on-Sea SS2 4LS

- 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 E Clarke against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00438/FULH was refused by notice dated 5 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear and side extension with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear and side extension with internal alterations in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 17/00438/FULH, dated 7 March 2017, 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 drawing: CR/NAK/01-650.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and this part of Crossfield Road.

Reasons

3. Crossfield Road is a residential street with a mix of houses and bungalows of varying design. No 42 is a low, end-terrace bungalow with a detached flat roofed garage to the rear. The drive leading to this garage occupies an uncharacteristically wide gap in the built frontage, between No 42 and the 2 storey house at No 44. The proposal would replace the garage with a pitched roof extension to the side and rear. A small, separate flat roof rear extension is also shown on the plans.

4. The Council raises no objection to the very discreetly located rear flat roofed extension. Its concern is that the side/rear extension would be excessively bulky and wide, with a poor roof design. The section of the extension to the side would, however, be comparatively narrow at just under half the width of the main bungalow and would retain a good gap to No 44. The rear section of the extension would hardly be seen from the street and would also be proportionate in scale, leaving ample garden space.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 1 (SPD1) *Design and Townscape Guide* advises that side extensions should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building. It says that this can generally be achieved by ensuring that the extension is set back behind the existing building frontage line and that the design, in particular the roof design, is fully integrated with the existing property.
6. The proposed design is somewhat unusual in that the new roof would largely be separate from the main roof, with a valley between. This does, however, effectively minimise the height and bulk of the extension and is not harmful within the varied architectural context of Crossfield Road. The new roof line would be well below the height of the main roof and even further below the level of No 44 next door. Its design would reflect that of the main roof and the extension would be set well back from the bungalow's front wall. As a result, the proposal be a modest feature that would integrate well with the existing bungalow and add interest to the street scene. It would improve the appearance of the site by replacing the poor quality garage with a well designed new structure.
7. I conclude that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the dwelling and this part of Crossfield Road. It therefore accords with the aims of Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's Development Management Document and SPD1, to ensure that extensions respect the character of the site and its local context, adopting a scale that is respectful and subservient to the original building and surrounding area. It likewise accords with the National Planning Policy Framework's emphasis on securing high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness.
8. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring the use of matching materials to protect the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR