
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 November 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th December 2019

Appeal A Ref: APP/D1590/D/19/3236837

21 St Vincents Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, SS0 7PP

- 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 Oscar Wood against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00951/FULH, dated 21 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is construct new pitch roof stairwell dormer to southern aspect and hipped dormer to eastern aspect to create habitable loft space.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/D1590/D/19/3236840

21 St Vincents Road, Westcliff-on-Sea, SS0 7PP

- 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 Oscar Wood against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01213/FULH, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is side and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ only in the detail of the design and scale of the proposed dormer extensions. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in each appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Milton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site, 21 St Vincents Road is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, located within the Milton Conservation Area and is covered by an Article 4 Direction.

5. The character of the Conservation Area is derived from the mix of architectural styles which occurred during the transition from mid-Victorian to Edwardian architecture. This is still evident in the buildings along St Vincents Road, which are further enhanced by the large street trees and frontage gardens.
6. The Milton Conservation Area Appraisal (MCCA) indicates that St Vincents Road was originally one of the most notable roads in the Borough. It has a number of high class residences with properties having elaborate decoration and a high degree of individuality. The MCAA indicates that it is the grandest street in the Conservation Area.
7. The appeal site is identified within the MCAA as being constructed in the late Victorian Period and it is considered to make a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area. The building displays the elaborate decoration identified within the MCAA, with a distinctive canted bay topped with ornamental ball features at its corners on the front elevation.
8. Appeal A and Appeal B both propose the construction of side and rear dormer windows. Appeal A proposes a pitched roof rear dormer and Appeal B proposes a flat roof rear dormer. Both schemes include a hipped roof side dormer and glazing to the existing rear gable.
9. The introduction of a side dormer as proposed by both appeals would alter the character of the existing roofline. The height of the dormer roof would extend above the gable roof into the main hipped roof. When viewed from the front of the dwelling the dormer would fill the space currently provided between the roofs of 19 and 21 St Vincents Road. This space currently helps to define the different architectural styles displayed between the properties, which is a particular feature of the Conservation Area.
10. The side dormer would be visible from within St Vincents Road and appear as a prominent and inappropriate feature within the street-scene. It would be an incongruous addition, which would fail to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area.
11. Appeal A proposes a pitched roof rear dormer which has been designed to replicate the existing rear gable end roof pitches. The dormer would be positioned between the two existing gable end elements and interrupt the original roof form, obscuring views of the main hipped roof. The introduction of a dormer in this location would result in a cluttered appearance to the rear elevation, which would detract from the original design of the dwelling.
12. Whilst views of the rear dormer from the public realm would be limited, given the depth of neighbouring gardens the rear dormer window would be clearly visible from a number of neighbouring properties and their gardens. In any event, limited public visibility would not obviate the need for the development to be of high-quality design.
13. Appeal B proposes a flat roof dormer which would reduce its overall height when compared with Appeal A. However, its position obscuring the main roofline would still replicate the harm that I have identified above for Appeal A.
14. I have had regard to the other dormer windows and roof extensions which are visible from within the rear garden of the appeal site. However, these examples confirm that such dormer extensions can be detrimental to the character and

appearance of an area and therefore should not be used as a reason to allow a similar development such as that before me.

15. I conclude that the development proposed by both Appeal A and Appeal B would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Milton Conservation Area. This would be contrary to policies K2 and CP4 of the Southend on Sea Core Strategy 2007 and policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Southend on Sea Development Management Document 2015. The proposals would also run counter to the aims and objectives of the Southend on Sea Supplementary Planning Document 1 Design and Townscape Guide (2009) and the MCAA.
16. Whilst the proposals in each case would not reach the high hurdle of substantial harm, they would nonetheless result in serious harm that requires clear and convincing justification. Consequently, the Framework says that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the appellant has outlined a personal benefit associated with both schemes, namely improvements to the quality of accommodation within the house, I do not consider that this would be a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm. The proposals therefore conflict with the Framework.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR