



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by Guy Davies BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3246464

19 Peel Avenue, Shoeburyness, Southend-on-Sea SS3 9ST

- 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 Darren Kempson against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01889/FULH, dated 15 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing 3 bedroom semi-detached property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of Peel Avenue.

Reasons

3. 11 Peel Avenue forms one half of a pair of semi-detached houses in a line of similar properties fronting the road. The houses are uniform in style with gable ended pitched roofs, and casement windows with top hung lights. Buildings are spaced apart by the width of a flat roofed single storey side projection and pedestrian walkway from their respective side boundaries. Peel Avenue forms part of a small estate of similarly designed properties, some of them being semi-detached and some terraced. Other than for some small additions, the houses in Peel Avenue remain largely as originally built.
4. The proposed side extension would be flush with the front and rear elevations of the existing building, and its roof would be hipped. This is contrary to the Council's design guidance¹ which advises that side extensions should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building. The document advises this can generally be achieved by ensuring that the extension is set back behind the existing building frontage line and that its design, in particular the roof, is fully integrated with the existing property.
5. In my view the hipped design of the roof to the side extension would introduce a discordant note into the appearance of the line of houses in Peel Avenue, all of which are gabled ended. The lack of any set back to the front elevation of

¹ Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Supplementary Planning Document 1: Design and Townscape Guide 2009

the side extension would also fail to make the extension appear subservient to the original building, and may give rise to the difficulty of keying in new brickwork where the facing brick to the existing building has weathered. The roof of the rear extension, although less visible than the side extension, would also appear awkward because its pitch would not match that of the existing building, and for that reason would fail to integrate satisfactorily with its design. Together, these features would harm the character and appearance of the street scene.

6. The Council has also criticised the design and proportions of the windows on the side elevation and front porch. I do not consider the porch window to be harmful as it would be of a similar design and alignment to others in the front elevation. While the high level window in the side elevation does not reflect other windows, its design is required to avoid overlooking, which in this case I consider to be more important. However, the lack of harm with regard to window design does not overcome my concerns on the other design issues.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to three examples of side extensions at 29, 31 and 33 Waking Road. When viewing these three properties I noticed that there were others in the same road that had also been extended in a similar manner. The style of these houses is different to those at Peel Avenue and the character of Waking Road is different as well with a greater variety of building ages and designs. I note that the extensions all maintain the roof form of the original buildings, which in their case is fully hipped.
8. The extensions in Waking Road are flush with the front elevations of the original properties. While I acknowledge that this is at odds with the Council's design guidance, I have limited information on when they were built and the reasons behind the Council granting permission for them. In so far as the current appeal is concerned, I do not consider they set a compelling precedence because of the differences in the style of the buildings and the more varied character of Waking Road. I consider departing from the design guidance in the more uniform and unaltered setting of Peel Avenue would appear discordant and harmful to the character of that particular road, which is not necessarily the case with other settings.
9. I conclude that as a result of poor design, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of Peel Avenue, and would therefore conflict with Policy CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document, which seek to promote good design that responds positively to the local context. It would also fail the advice contained within the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide for the same reason.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Guy Davies