



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3261613

4 Howards Close, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, SS9 3GA

- 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 H Ife against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01056/FULH, dated 3 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'ground floor extension and new first floor over with pitched roof.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policies KP2 and CP4 in the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) and policies DM1 and DM3 in the Council's Development Management Document (2015). Those policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure that proposals improve the urban environment through quality design, secure a good relationship with existing development and have regard to the Council's Design and Townscape Guide SPD, respect the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its architectural approach, size and form and adopt a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and the surrounding area.
3. The appeal site comprises a modern semi-detached house at the head of a residential cul-de-sac which has a backland position accessed from a drive leading from Nelson Road. The wider area has a mixed use character with a variety of uses and buildings on the busy London Road nearby. The pair of semi-detached houses has a staggered building line with the appeal dwelling having a two storey gabled projection forward of its pitched roof neighbour. This gives the existing front elevation an attractive appearance and breaks up the mass of the building.
4. The proposed extension would replace a small existing single storey front projection of 4m which is attached to the two storey projection. The new extension would have a main hipped roof and would project forward by 8m, with the first floor cantilevered over the ground floor and a lean-to pitched roof over the single storey part to the side.

5. Despite its backland position and set-back behind a car park, the extension would be clearly seen from London Road. The ridge height and width would be less than those of the main part of the house. However, its length would match that of the house and when seen from London Road it would not be sufficiently subservient as required by policy DM3 and therefore its size and scale would not respect those of the dwelling. I have noted its position next to the art deco style Arlington Rooms (an entertainment/function venue) and that there was a previously withdrawn application for three blocks of flats there. However, the mixed use and character of the area does not override the policy requirement for the scale to respect and be subservient to that of the *original building* as well as the area.
6. The appellant says that the hipped roof was introduced to reduce bulk and mass but this affirms to me that the length of the extension is disproportionate to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the hipped roof form is not appropriate in this context given the gabled design of the house and would detract from the original design of the pair, notwithstanding the variety of roof forms in the area.
7. Whilst I agree with the appellant that the cantilevered first floor is a modest design feature which would not detract from the dwelling or the area, my findings in regard to the length and hipped roof form of the proposal are significant and overriding.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed extension, by reason of its size, scale and form would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. As such it would be contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector