



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/21/3277391

8 Dynevor Gardens, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 2RG

- 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 Tracy Ritchie against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00617/FULH, dated 23 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of roof extensions and installation of dormers to rear to form habitable accommodation in roof, rooflights to front and side and alterations to rear elevation
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description of development provided on the decision notice in the banner heading above as this more accurately describes the scope of development proposed than the description given on the application form.
3. 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

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey, 4/5 bedroom house, which has recently been extended to the rear to provide additional living space. It is situated in a residential street comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached houses. These feature half-timbering, bay windows and prominent gables which, together with ample planting, contribute to a characterful and pleasant residential environment. The appeal property includes a 2-storey side addition. This is set behind the line of the main front elevation and has a lower roof making it clearly subservient to the original part of the house.

6. In 2020 planning permission was granted for the erection of a “mansard roof extension”, the installation of rooflights to the front and rear, the conversion of the garage into habitable accommodation and the erection of a single storey rear extension (ref: 20/00290/FULH). The information before me indicates that the 2020 permission has been commenced and as such it is a fall-back position to which I attach significant weight.
7. Like the 2020 permission, the appeal proposal would include the expansion of the main roof of the house to provide second floor level accommodation. Unlike the 2020 permission, it would also include the formation of a pair of dormers within the rear roof slope and the raising and expansion of the roof above the side wing. Whilst the dormers would be relatively large, they would not overly dominate the expanded roof above the main part of the house.
8. The expansion of the side wing would however be bulky and cumbersome. The subordinate relationship between the wing and the main part of the house would be denuded and compromised and the raised eaves at the front and gable to the rear would be incongruous features that would further disrupt the balance of the property.
9. Due to its siting, bulk and design I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequentially it fails to comply with Policy 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.
10. Photographs of various forms of roof additions on nearby buildings have been provided. None of these roof additions are directly comparable to the appeal proposal and, as each planning application needs to be considered on its individual merits, I attach limited weight to these additions.
11. The appeal proposal does not include any clear energy efficiency measures over and above those that could be provided through the execution of the 2020 permission or through improvements to the property without increasing its size. I do not therefore consider that the appeal proposal provides any material benefits in this respect.
12. I note, and have given weight to, the local Member of Parliament’s supportive e-mail and the appellant’s desire for additional space for working from home. These matters do not however outweigh the clear harm identified above.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR