



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2020

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3254857

1 Boundary Way, Shoeburyness, Essex, SS3 9QF.

- 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 and Mrs Ian and Sara Davis against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00245/FULH, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as erect a new orangery, with parapet walls and a roof lantern, to the south and west of the existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Procedural matters

3. I have been provided with amended plans and, further, I understand that planning permission has been granted for a similar extension to that the subject of this appeal under Council Ref: 20/00943/FULH. In respect of amended plans it would be for the Council to consider these in the first instance. Accordingly, and whether or not planning permission has subsequently been granted for an alternative proposal, I shall determine this appeal on the basis of the scheme design before me as determined by the Council and subsequently appealed.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, 1 Boundary Way, is located at the junction of Boundary Way, Magazine Road and Gunners Rise.
5. It is one half of a pair of semi-detached three-storey houses. This pair is, in turn, one of a row of uniform pairs of semi-detached houses that extend along Boundary Way and face on to open land, in use as a cricket pitch. Part of the side and the rear garden areas of number 1 are enclosed by a high boundary wall. Due to the open nature of the estate layout at this point the house is prominent in the street scene.

6. The surrounding area comprises semi-detached two and three-storey houses and low rise flatted blocks of similar mass, form and design. As I saw the development is generally relatively recent and the design and layout of the properties is very regimented in appearance and character. The site, while not within, is adjacent to the Shoebury Garrison Conservation Area.
7. The appellants propose the erection of an 'L' shaped single storey side and rear extension. The bulk of the extension would be in the rear garden and therefore given its single storey form would not impact significantly on either the form of the building or the established layout of the development. However, due to its 'L' shape plan a small section would project in front of the line of the existing garden wall. Therefore although set back, behind the front wall of the house and the original two-storey side projection, would appear as a new and prominent addition in the street scene.
8. Further, due to the width and height of the side extension when viewed from the street, having regard to the proportions and vertical emphasis of the design of the host property, it would appear out of proportion and therefore an incongruous addition in this context. In addition due to the proportions of the new street window it would, in turn, serve to reinforce the proposed extension's contrasting horizontal emphasis.
9. Given the corner location of number 1 and the open nature of the estate layout the projection of the proposed addition into the street scene would, given its jarring proportions, appear as an overly dominant an alien form of development here. As well as detracting from the architectural integrity of the host property and the semi-detached pair it would cause significant harm to the established character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.
10. Notwithstanding the harm that I have identified I agree with the Council's conclusion that the proposal would nevertheless have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the adjoining conservation area.
11. I therefore conclude in respect of the main issue that the proposed development, while having a neutral impact on the Shoebury Garrison Conservation Area, would if built as designed, cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene. To allow it would therefore be contrary to the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Local Development Framework–Development Plan Document 1-*Core Strategy* (Adopted December 2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 (as amended by Technical Housing Standards Policy Transitional Statement (2015) of the Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Local Development Framework - *Development Management Document* (Adopted July 2015) and the advice contained in the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) as they relate to, amongst other things, the quality of development.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR