



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/21/3278358

16 Woodberry Close, Leigh on Sea SS9 4QT

- 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 Abbott against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00358/FULH, dated 15 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front and side pitched roof 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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached bungalow with an L-shaped plan form and a garage attached to the side. It is located in a residential cul-de-sac and forms part of a group of handsome bungalows of similar design that have projecting elements to the front and a mix of hipped and gable roof forms. These bungalows create a high quality and characterful environment.
5. The proposal would comprise the removal of the garage and the erection of a single-storey addition that would wrap around part of the front and side of the property together with the expansion of the roof. The front elevation of the proposal would be flush with the existing forward projecting element of the dwelling and the proposal as a whole would result in the formation of a symmetrical frontage. This arrangement would be at odds with the asymmetrical layout of neighbouring bungalows and the expansion of the roof

closer to the road would make the property notably more prominent in the street scene than its neighbours.

6. Due to its siting, size and design the proposal would be an overly dominant and incongruous development that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. It 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.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR