



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2020

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3250457

22 Hayes Barton, Shoeburyness SS1 3TS

- 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 Louise Wheeler against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01997/FULH, dated 24 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as a “front extension and changes to facade”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect on the streetscene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a detached two storey dwelling. Having a single two storey front projection, either hipped or gabled, is a fairly common feature of houses in the street. However, the proposed development would result in two of these at the host property. Moreover, these would project forward of the immediately adjacent dwellings, as clearly shown on the proposed site plan. The dwelling is currently set further back at the front than the neighbouring houses. Nevertheless, rather than suitably improving the relationship with these properties, because of the position and two storey scale and bulk of the forward projections, the extended dwelling would appear overly dominant in the street.
4. The vertically emphasised central first floor window would unduly contrast with the mainly horizontal orientation of windows in the street and those in the front of the host dwelling. The flat top of the porch would also be out of keeping with the generally sloping nature of roofs at the front in Hayes Barton. These matters would draw further attention to the incongruous and discordant nature of the development. The pair of two storey projections, vertical window and flat roof would be unduly out of keeping with the nature of development in Hayes Barton.
5. The Appellant has provided photographs of a number of dwellings in the locality where development has taken place. It is indicated that a considerable number

- of extensions have been built in Hayes Barton. However, only two of the properties specifically identified are located in this street, so that most of these are not part of the immediate context against which I have assessed the effect of the proposal. The two examples in Hayes Barton are on the opposite side of the street to the appeal site.
6. Moreover, the dwelling at 12 Hayes Barton does not have any projections at the front with a full two storeys below eaves level. That at no. 8 only has a single two storey forward projection, which is fully hipped. Those proposed at the appeal site would be significantly bulkier, being fully gabled and partly hipped. Neither of the dwellings at nos. 8 and 12 have a large vertically emphasised window at the front or a flat roofed porch. These cases are not therefore comparable to the current proposal. In any event, I do not have the approved plans for any of these developments or the Council's report showing why any permissions were granted. Therefore, no precise comparison can be made with the appeal scheme anyway.
 7. The side dormer additions would reflect existing features at the host property. The facing materials of wooden cladding and render would be compatible with those found elsewhere in the street, with the height of the dwelling not being increased. I have no reason to believe there would be other than adequate car parking and garden space. However, none of these matters would prevent the harmful effects I have described above.
 8. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the proposal would harm the streetscene and the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality. Among other things, Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy 2007, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document 2015 and Supplementary Planning Document 1, Design and Townscape Guide 2009 (SPD), intend that development should be well designed, while maintaining and respecting the character of the area, site and surroundings. For the reasons given there would be conflict with the development plan and SPD.
 9. I am reinforced in my view regarding the adverse impact of the development by the importance placed on design in the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). This indicates that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve and good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. The failure to achieve good design in this case means there would also be conflict with the Framework.
 10. The current proposal was revised following a previous application but this does not, in itself, confer acceptability. I share the view of the Council that the position of the extensions would prevent any undue loss of light or outlook to adjacent properties. A condition requiring obscured glazing and restricted opening of the new windows at the sides would have safeguarded the privacy of neighbours had the appeal succeeded. However, taking account of all other matters raised, because of the harm that I have found it is determined that the appeal fails. In reaching this decision I have taken account of the representations made by local residents and on their behalf.

M Evans

INSPECTOR