



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3267211

31 Waterford Road, Shoeburyness, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, SS3 9HJ

- 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 Mrs S Hind against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01441/FULH, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Part single and two storey rear extension, first floor side extensions with internal alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'Erect part single/part two storey rear extension, first floor side extension, extend front to form pitched roof and install rooflights to front' and as this describes the proposal more accurately, I have used this as the basis for my decision.

Reasons

3. 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 size, massing, form and detail and adopt a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and the surrounding area.
4. Waterford Road comprises mainly semi-detached and detached bungalows within a wider suburban, residential area in which there is a variety of dwelling types, sizes and styles. At my visit I noted a larger, contemporary dwelling at the southern end of the road but as that is some distance away and has its main elevation facing the sea front, it has a different context from this proposal. In the immediate area around the appeal site, however, dwellings are mostly of one or one and a half storeys, of a modest size and an unassuming character. The appeal dwelling occupies a wide plot and is unusual

in its two storey form which, together with its variety of roof forms, gives it a distinctive character from the surrounding development. Nonetheless, its tall chimney, projecting hipped roof and small, wide first floor window in the front elevation give it a modest, cottage-like appearance which sits comfortably amongst its neighbours.

5. The proposed front extension would replace the existing garage and the asymmetrical pitched roof which extends across the front elevation by continuing the existing ridge line to form a chalet style roof with a low eaves height. This would bring some cohesion to the dwelling and would represent a positive improvement. However, the large glazed and gabled projection in the centre of the front elevation, by reason of its excessive width and height, would be disproportionate to the scale of the dwelling. As such, its scale would dominate the front elevation and this would be unduly emphasised by the large amount of glazing. It would be discordant with the modest character of the existing dwelling and most of the neighbouring dwellings.
6. The rear extension would project by some 3m from the main rear wall, with two projecting gables of the same ridge height as the main roof. This would result in a disproportionate massing which, when seen in the approach from the south along Waterford Road and from between dwellings on Leitrim Avenue, would not be sufficiently subservient to the existing dwelling.
7. Therefore, the proposed front projection and rear extensions would, by reason of their size, scale, massing and detail, unduly dominate the modest character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The proposal would be contrary, therefore, to the development plan policies referred to above. There are no material considerations that would outweigh my findings and the appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector