
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2020

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3261135

472 Woodgrange Drive, Southend-On-Sea, Essex SS1 3ED

- 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 Neelam Prashar against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00537/FULH, dated 25 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and
 - ii) the living conditions of occupiers of 474 Woodgrange Drive, with particular regard to outlook and enclosure.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with an attached garage to the side and a conservatory addition to the rear. It is situated in a residential area and forms part of a group of bungalows of similar age and appearance. These properties generally retain their original hipped roof forms and many have small conservatories to the rear. As a consequence the bungalows retain a high degree of unity of appearance.
4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey rear addition that would extend across the full-width of the main part of the bungalow. This would have a pitched roof to tie in with the existing side slopes. The drawings indicate that there would be a wide and prominent gable facing the garden with a flat top.
5. Due to its height, bulk and massing the proposal would be an incongruous and overly dominant form of development that would be out of keeping with the

appearance of the rears of the neighbouring properties and, due to its size and roof form would be a discordant addition to the host property.

6. For these reasons I conclude that the rear addition would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. It therefore fails to comply with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend On Sea Core Strategy Development Plan Document One (2007) (CS) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document (2015) (DMD) which require developments to respect the character and scale of the site and existing neighbourhood and maintain and enhance the character of residential areas. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 1, Design and Townscape Guide 2009 (SPD) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Living conditions

7. The appeal proposal would be close to the boundary shared with 474 Woodgrange Drive and a large expanse of its roof would be visible from the rear garden of this property. However, the main rear elevation of No.474 and its conservatory are set away from the shared boundary as would be the uppermost part of the proposal. As such the proposal would have a minimal impact of levels of outlook from rear windows within No.474 and its garden would not be overly enclosed by the proposal.
8. For these reasons the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No.474 and therefore it accords with CS Policies KP2 and CP4, DM Policies DM1 and DM3 and the aims of the Framework and SPD in this particular respect.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to a recent planning permission for a gable-roofed extension to a property in the neighbouring street and various approved developments elsewhere in the area. The nearby scheme involves a smaller extension to a narrower property and does not include a flat-topped gable. It is not therefore directly comparable to the appeal proposal. The evidence provided indicates that the other schemes are not comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, as each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits, I attribute limited weight to these matters.

Conclusion

10. I note that the appellant has sought to overcome a number of earlier refused applications for planning permission and prior approval. However, for the reasons set out under the first main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR