



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2020

by Michael Evans BA MA MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3248660

1 Meadway, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 8PJ

- 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 Daniel Stafford against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02095/FULH, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and roof alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and roof alterations, at 1 Meadway, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 8PJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02095/FULH, dated 11 November 2019, subject to the following 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: 2294 Revision A and 2296 Revision A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal concerns a two storey detached dwelling. The two storey side extension would replace fairly low single floor structures and project towards the pavement in Kings Road at the northern end of Meadway. Dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site on this side of Kings Road vary to a significant degree in their distance from the footway. Furthermore, factors such as the space between properties and intervening vegetation tend to prevent them from being readily seen in conjunction with each other. Therefore, how the dwellings compare in their proximity to the pavement is often not readily apparent when looking from the street anyway. This contrasts with the fairly

tightly spaced dwellings on the other side of Kings Road where there is a clear, strongly defined and particularly consistent building line.

4. I also take the view that the attractive degree of openness found in the southern part largely derives from the gaps between dwellings, rather than their distance from the street. Moreover, the two storey side addition would be set back from the footway, with this dimension not being unacceptably out of line with the variation found on this side of the street. The bulk and consequent visual impact would also be appreciably mitigated by the fully hipped roof form. As a result of these factors, the development would not be overly dominant or unduly enclosing when seen from Kings Road.
5. For the above reasons, it is concluded that the character and appearance of the locality and the streetscene would not be harmed. There would be compliance with 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), which intend, among other things, that development should be well designed, while maintaining and respecting the character of the area, site and surroundings. In the above circumstances, the resultant building would not look out of place as a result of being uncharacteristically set forward of the neighbours and therefore not conflict with this advice given in the SPD.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) 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. Because a good standard of design would result in this case, the scheme would accord with the Framework.
7. Taking account of all other matters raised, it is therefore determined that the appeal succeeds. In reaching this decision I have considered the representations made by a member of the public objecting to the proposal.
8. A condition specifying the approved plans is necessary to provide certainty. The facing materials used should match those of the existing dwelling to protect its appearance.

M Evans

INSPECTOR