



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2021

**by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 09 March 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3263462**

**395 Woodgrange Drive, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3DY**

- 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 Sellicks against the decision of Southend on Sea Borough Council.
  - The application Ref: 20/01040/FULH, dated 1 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
  - The development proposed is small single storey side extension to the existing property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a prominent corner position at the junction of Buttery's and Woodgrange Drive. These roads form a crossroads with Brettenham Drive. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with dwellings of varied design. The appeal building and No.389 Woodgrange Drive both have elevations set back from Buttery's. Dwellings at the other side of the crossroads are also set back from Brettenham Drive. This provides a sense of spaciousness and regularity in the general pattern of development.
4. The appeal building is a two storey detached dwelling which has been extended to the side and rear, with a rear conservatory linking to an outbuilding within the garden. A long side boundary wall along Buttery's screens part of that development from public view. The proposed side extension has been reduced in size and scale compared with the proposed two-storey and single storey development (ref: APP/D1590/D/19/3220785) which was dismissed on appeal in March 2019.
5. The appeal proposal concerns a single storey extension which would have a footprint of around 2.9 m x 7 m and a height of around 3 m. It would infill the gap between the south-western elevation of the house and Buttery's. The extension would have a flat roof, finished in sedum. The proposal includes the relocation of the main entrance door, from the side of the dwelling to the front

elevation in order to allow a wheelchair ramp to be located adjacent to the frontage parking area.

6. The Council's *Supplementary Planning Document 1: Design and Townscape Guide (2009)* indicates that side extensions can easily become overbearing and dominate the original property. In order to avoid this, side extensions should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building. Contrary to advice in the guidance, the proposed extension would not be set back from the existing building frontage line. Even though the proposed extension would be single storey it would conflict with the pattern of development at this location by infilling space between the parent building and Butterys. The extension would appear prominent and out of character in this corner position. It would have a blank side wall facing Butterys. This would add unduly to the extent of brick boundary wall which already exists at the property and would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene at the entrance to Butterys from Woodgrange Drive.
7. In reaching my conclusion I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which includes the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. I note the family circumstances. Whilst the proposal would provide additional accommodation, I do not consider it to be essential accommodation and consequently it does not follow that the appeal should be allowed.

## **Conclusion**

8. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene. It would conflict with policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy which, amongst other things, seek to ensure quality design and that proposals respect the character and scale of the existing neighbourhood. It would fail to comply with Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (DMD) policy DM1 regarding design quality. It would also conflict with DMD policy DM3, which, along with the *Design and Townscape Guide*, requires all alterations and additions to make a positive contribution to the character of the existing building and surrounding area. In terms of other material considerations, the proposed extension would conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.
9. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the sustainability measures included in the property by the appellant. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Martin H Seddon*

INSPECTOR