



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/20/3262120

6 Philpott Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 4RL

- 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 Ilir Berisha against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 20/00950/FULH, dated 15 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is removal of rear garage/store and erection of single side extension.
-

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, the streetscene and pattern of development.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a modern end terrace dwelling located with its side elevation near Philpott Avenue. It is part of a development of 4 short terraces which are aligned at right angles to Philpott Road. The terraced layout is repeated as a mirror image, after a short terrace of 3 dwellings which is sited parallel to Philpott Avenue. Gardens and parking spaces are situated between the terraces emphasising the regularity in the development pattern.
4. None of the end terrace dwellings have been extended at the side towards Philpott Avenue. Some dwellings have outhouses in the space next to their boundary fence with Philpott Avenue.
5. The proposed extension would be set back by around 225 mm from the original dwelling, generally in accordance with advice in the Council's *Design and Townscape Guide (2009)*. It would also have a pitched roof to allow the eaves to be at the lowest facing Philpott Avenue. However, the extension would appear out of character and prominent in the street scene because of its location, size, and scale at the end of the terrace and because of its proximity to Philpott Avenue. The longer terraces located at right-angles to Philpott Avenue form a strong building line. The proposed extension would disrupt this regularity in the layout of the buildings by adding a prominent extension between the building line of these terraces and Philpott Avenue.

6. There is an existing single storey building near the Philpott Avenue/Hamstel Road junction at No.140 Hamstel Road. It is a flat-roofed garage, and unlike the appeal proposal, it is not located in-line with the side elevation of the building. No.140 Hamstel Road is part of a semi-detached pair of houses at the entrance to Philpott Avenue and not part of the regular layout of terraces which includes the appeal building. In contrast, the appeal proposal would retain a fence to avoid a blank brick wall next to Philpott Avenue, and would not have a flat roof. However, I find that the existence of the garage at No.140 Hamstel Road is insufficient reason to justify allowing the appeal before me. That is because the dwelling would be extended to take up space between the end of a terrace and Philpott Avenue, thereby disrupting the distinctive layout of development.
7. The proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building, streetscene and overall pattern of development. 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.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account, including the proposed siting of the extension on "unused concrete amenity space" and recycling of concrete as hardcore. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to extend the dwelling to accommodate larger family accommodation. However, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR