



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/W/20/3249324

10 Progress Road, Eastwood SS9 5LY

- 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 Andy Robinson (Safestore) against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02218/FUL, dated 29 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is the extension of the existing building to create additional self-storage (B8).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension to the existing building to create additional self-storage (B8) at 10 Progress Road, Eastwood SS9 5LY, in accordance with the application Ref 19/02218/FUL, dated 29 November 2019, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised plan was submitted with the appeal that proposes a small amendment to the elevations by the inclusion of a yellow strip at high level to match the existing building. This change would be minor in nature and the Council has had the opportunity to comment on the revised plan through the appeal process. As such, I do not consider that any party would be prejudiced by my acceptance of it. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the revised plan.
3. The inclusion of mezzanine floors is not referenced within the description of development. In addition, the appellant's Statement of Case and the Council's officer report confirms that such features do not form part of this application. I have assessed the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site accommodates a sizeable, industrial style, self-storage building positioned at the southern edge of a large industrial estate. It is bound to the west by Progress Road which extends northwards through the industrial estate from the A127 Southend Arterial Road to the south. Large commercial and

industrial buildings are set close to the appeal building on three sides. It is in this industrial/commercial context that the site is read.

6. Within the site, immediately to the south of the appeal building, is an area of open grassed land which is shaped to follow the curve of an adjacent service road. This is not a designated section of open land and there are other, larger, areas of open land along the service road. It is also enclosed on one side by an adjacent fast food restaurant. In this context, the contribution that this grassed land makes to the softening of built form in this part of the industrial estate is not significant. Furthermore, as the site is set back considerably from the A127, the contribution it makes to the wider openness of the dual carriageway and its junction with Progress Road is limited.
7. This proposal seeks permission to extend part of the southern elevation of the appeal building. This extension would only cover approximately half of the width of this elevation and would not exceed the overall height of the host building. It would also be constructed using a materials palette to match the storage facility. Whilst the amount of buff brickwork would differ from the existing building, this brickwork, together with the inclusion of curtain wall glazing, would assist in breaking up the proposal's bulk and mass. Overall, the extension would appear as a proportionate addition to the storage facility that would not disrupt its functional commercial appearance.
8. The proposal would not extend beyond the front elevation of the adjacent fast food restaurant and would not be significantly taller than it. It would also be similar in height compared to a nearby car showroom. Consequently, although the proposal would be more 'solid' in appearance compared to adjacent buildings, it would not unduly dominate them. The proposal would also be sufficiently set back from the southern entrance to the industrial estate so as not to dominate this particular gateway. I accept that the extension would project into the grassed area adjacent to the host property, eroding its openness. However, there would still be sufficient space about the appeal building so that it did not appear cramped upon its plot in relation to its size. In addition, the extension's positioning and overall scale would not significantly harm the open settings of both the A127 and its junction with Project Road.
9. Taking all of the above into account, I am not persuaded that the proposal would disrupt the layout and pattern of built form within this industrial estate. On the contrary, it would integrate effectively with the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. In reaching this view, I am also mindful that the site is within an Employment Growth Area as identified by the Council's development plan. The scheme would support economic growth and productivity, in line with both local planning policy and the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
10. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that developments optimise the use of land in a manner that responds to local context and promote high quality design and urban environments. The proposal would also accord with the advice of the supplementary planning document 1 design and townscape Guide and the National Design Guide which have similar objectives.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions put forward by the Council. Having regard to the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework, I have amended the wording where necessary in the interests of clarity and simplicity. In addition to the standard time limit, a condition specifying the plans is required in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed conditions ensuring materials match the existing building as shown on submitted plans and requiring the submission of an appropriate landscaping plan. These are necessary in the interest of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal scheme would accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with this plan. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 plans: 4638/01, 4638/02, 4638/03, 4638/04, 4638/SK10, 4638/SK11 and 4638/SK13.
- 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the existing building as shown on approved plans.
- 4) Within three months of the date of this decision, a Landscaping Plan, including details of boundary treatments and hard surfacing, as well as a timetable for its implementation, shall be submitted to the local planning authority to be approved in writing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details.

End of Schedule of Conditions