



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3277706

267 Maplin Way North, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3NX

- 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 N Sims against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00503/FULH, dated 9 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single/part two-storey rear extension, two-storey side extension and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the erection of a part single/part two-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the erection of a single storey front extension at 267 Maplin Way North, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3NX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00503/FULH, dated 9 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2484/1A & 2484/2D, in so far as they relate to the works approved.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house with a projecting single-storey element at the front, which accommodates a double garage. It is located in a residential street comprising mid twentieth century houses. Many of the houses have been extended and altered at the front which has somewhat denuded the original uniformity of the street scene.
5. The appeal proposal would primarily comprise the erection of a part-single and part 2-storey rear and side extension. The rear addition would extend a significant distance beyond the original rear building line of the appeal property and the 2-storey part of this would project above the level of the eaves. The rear addition would extend further rearwards than the 2-storey full-width rear extension at the property to the south and would be at odds with the arrangement at the rear of the house to the north. As a consequence, the rear addition would result in an overly dominant and incongruous form of development.
6. Due to its siting, bulk and height, I conclude that the rear extension would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This aspect of the proposal therefore fails to comply with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend On Sea Core Strategy Development Plan Document One (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document (2015) which require developments to respect the character and scale of the site and existing neighbourhood and maintain and enhance the character of residential areas. There is also conflict with the aims of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 1, Design and Townscape Guide 2009 and the Framework.
7. The appeal property retains its original front entrance arrangement, which is a common characteristic of neighbouring houses. The proposal includes a small enlargement to the porch together with an expansion of the flat roof in front of the porch. These changes would be minor and compatible with the appearance of the building. For these reasons I am satisfied that they would not result in unacceptable harm to the host property or the surrounding area. This aspect of the proposal therefore accords with the aforementioned policies. It is clearly functionally and physically severable from the rear/side extension and a split decision can be issued.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings, where applicable, is imposed.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail in respect of the rear/side extension and succeed in respect of the front extension. A split decision is therefore issued.

S Poole INSPECTOR