



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2021

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/20/3267683

15 Blackgate Road, Shoeburyness, Essex, SS3 9SP

- 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 and Mrs Worrell against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01965/FULH, dated 19 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, loft conversion and internal alterations (re-submission of 20/01488/FULH)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The Council's decision describes the proposal as 'Erect single storey rear extension, two storey side extension, install rooflights to front and rear, alter elevations (amended proposal)' 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 street scene. 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 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 including size and detail and adopt a scale that is respectful and subservient to that of the original building and the surrounding area.
4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house located within a residential area on a slip road which is set back behind a deep grass verge from the main Blackgate Road. The other semi-detached dwellings in the row were built to a uniform design in a yellow stock brick finish with main pitched roofs, single storey flat roof projections set back on the side elevation and front doors with flat roof canopies over. Two of the dwellings have been altered with two storey side extensions. Whilst the dwellings are modest and unassuming in their character with an undistinctive style, their broadly consistent design and symmetry gives a sense of cohesion and unity to the street scene.

5. The proposed extension includes a single storey element across the rear to which the Council has not raised any objection other than to the timber cladding material or to the proposed rooflights. Given its modest depth and its discrete siting on the rear elevation, the proposed material of the rear extension would be acceptable and I am satisfied this and the rooflights would not result in harm to the dwelling or the street scene.
6. However, the Council's concerns relate to the width, design and material of the proposed two storey side extension. At my visit I noted that although the proposed width would be slightly greater than that of the adjacent extension at no 11, it would be very similar in width to that of the extension at no 21. In any case, the difference in width between this and the adjacent extension would not be easily discernible and I am satisfied that the size and scale of the proposal would be acceptable.
7. The pitched roof form of the side extension would be similar to that of the other extensions and would match that of the existing dwelling. However, the proposed layout of a large hall and landing has resulted in a change to the position and size of opening of the front door and two narrow vertical landing windows which are at odds with the proportions of the existing windows. The proposed black timber cladding would also contrast with the brick material of the dwelling and its neighbours.
8. Whilst these design features can sometimes be made in an existing dwelling without the need for planning permission, in this case they form part of the proposal and would draw attention to the extension, reducing its subservience to the main part of the dwelling and visually unbalancing the symmetry of the pair. A contrasting design approach may be appropriate in other cases but in this instance the appeal dwelling forms one of a row in which the consistency of approach is a positive factor.
9. Therefore, the proposed two storey extension, by reason of its detailed design and the proposed timber cladding, would be unduly dominant in this context.

Conclusion

10. 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 street scene. 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