
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 October 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3272928

125 Broadclyst Gardens, Thorpe Bay, SS1 3QY

- 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 M Downer against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00143/FULH, dated 21 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. On 20 July 2021, the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I am satisfied that the updates to the Framework do not materially affect its content insofar as it is relevant to the main issues of this appeal, and I am therefore satisfied that no parties have been prejudiced by my having regard to it.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the rear garden scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached, chalet style property. It has large, flat roof dormers on both its front and rear elevation as well as a conservatory to the rear.
5. The surrounding area comprises mainly of chalet style dwellings. Many of these dwellings have been altered and extended over the years with some displaying two storey additions to the front and to the rear.
6. The appeal proposal would replace the existing flat roof rear dormer with a large two storey extension which would extend across the rear elevation of the dwelling. The extension would have a maximum depth of about 4.5 metres with two large projections with a ridged roof and gable end, linked by a central flat roof section. The ridge height of the proposed gables would be the same as the main ridge of the host dwelling. The existing conservatory would be removed.

7. The proposed two storey extension would completely alter the appearance of the rear elevation of the dwelling such that none of its original features would be apparent. Due to the depth of the extension and its expanse across the full width of the dwelling, in my view the proposal would be an unduly bulky addition which would not be subservient to or respect the scale, character and appearance of the host chalet dwelling. Furthermore, I consider that the design of the extension, with two large prominent gables and a central flat roof section would appear a contrived and incongruous form of development, having regard to the modest size and scale of the host dwelling.
8. I also consider that the proposed extension would be highly prominent in relation to the existing rear garden scene. Whilst several of the surrounding dwellings also have been extended to the rear, most of these extensions are not of the same scale or design as the appeal proposal and do not dominate the rear elevation and rear garden environment to such an extent. Overall, I consider that the proposed extension would be of a scale and design that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and in particular, the rear garden scene.
9. The appellant has highlighted several examples in the immediate area of similar chalet dwellings that have been extended at two storey level. However, in the majority of cases, the two storey extensions do not extend across the full width of the elevation, thus enabling part of the original dwelling to be retained. Accordingly, in my opinion, these extensions do not generally have the same impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area as the appeal proposal.
10. I also note the original design of the adjacent dwelling, 123 Broadclyst Gardens, which has its main ridge at ninety degrees to the road frontage and a two storey gable to the rear. However, in my view, the original design and appearance of No 123 does not justify the extent of extension proposed to 125 Broadclyst Gardens.
11. I appreciate that the proposed extension would enable the living accommodation within the dwelling to be improved. However, this does not alter my concerns with regard to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.
12. In conclusion, I consider that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area with particular reference to the rear garden scene. Thus, it would be contrary to Policies CP4 and KP2 of the Southend on Sea Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document (2015) as well as advice contained within the Supplementary Planning Document 1 Design and Townscape Guide 2009 and the Framework which together seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design that respects local context and the scale, nature and character of existing development.

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR