
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/W/20/3253444

207A Eastern Esplanade, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3AD

- 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 & Mrs Armstrong-Payne against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00129/FUL, dated 23 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormers to front and rear, balcony with railings to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a mid terrace two storey dwelling within a mixed commercial and residential street opposite the seafront. The dwellings along Eastern Esplanade comprise a mix of flats and two storey buildings, some of which, including the appeal site, have been subdivided into flats. The dwellings vary in their appearance, design and height. In particular the differing size and scale of properties create a varied street scene. This adds positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance in relation to dormer windows and in particular states that large box style dormers should be avoided, especially where they have public impact. Dormer windows should be incidental in the roof slope and should have windows which are smaller than those on lower floors.
5. Whilst the proposed front dormer would be set below the ridgeline and up from the eaves level, the overall width of the proposed dormer is not incidental to the existing roof slope. Although the proposed French doors would be aligned with the bay window at first floor, the size of the opening would not be smaller than those on the lower floors, and the overall scale of the dormer would be exacerbated by the inclusion of the second floor balcony.

6. The scale of the proposed dormer, which would occupy most of the roof space, combined with the proposed second floor balcony would be a dominant addition which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling. It would also be highly visible along Eastern Esplanade and would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature within the street-scene.
7. Along Eastern Esplanade it is possible to see other dormer window extensions and balconies which have been constructed on neighbouring properties. However, some of 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.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Core Strategy 2007 (CS) which requires development to maintain and enhance the appeal and character of residential areas, securing good relationships with existing development and respecting the scale and nature of that development and Policy KP2 of the CS which reiterates these development principles.
9. The development would also fail to accord with Policy DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Development Management Document 2015 (DMD) which requires additions to a building to make a positive contribution to the character of the original building and the surrounding area and policy DM1 which sets out the design principles for the development, which is linked to the SPD.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR