



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/21/3278234

32 Greenways, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS1 3BS

- 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 Gary Johnson against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00622/FULH, dated 2 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second floor 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 building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located in a residential street comprising a mix of bungalows and 2-storey houses. It forms one half of a handsome and distinctive semi-detached pair of largely identical 2-storey houses. The main difference between the pair is that the attached neighbour, 34 Greenways, has a roof level addition. This is set back from the front and side elevations of the property and is therefore a relatively inconsequential element in the street scene. The pair of houses therefore retain a high degree of symmetry, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of a roof addition to provide a bedroom, en-suite and dressing room. This would be set behind the front elevation of the property but would protrude forward of the roof addition at No.34 and would, in part, extend to the side elevation of the property. The proposal would be more apparent in views along the street than the existing

roof addition and would consequently have a greater impact on the original symmetry of the pair of houses than the earlier addition.

6. Due to its size and siting I conclude that the proposal would be an over dominant and incongruous addition that would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. 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 (SPD) and the Framework.
7. The appellant has referred to a planning permission granted in 1988 for the erection of a roof extension at the appeal property and the extract of approved drawing provided indicates that the rear part of this scheme was similar to the appeal proposal. As the 1988 planning permission has long since expired and the policies under which that permission was granted have been superseded multiple times, I attach limited weight to the 1988 consent.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR