



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2021

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3281906

29 St Augustines Avenue, Thorpe Bay SS1 3JH

- 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 & Mrs Steptoe against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00695/FULH, dated 6 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion with ground & first floor rear extension with alterations of externals of existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey house in a residential area on the outskirts of Southend-on-Sea. Dwellings in the surrounds vary in scale, design and detailing and add visual interest to the vicinity.
4. I saw at my site visit a number of other properties in the locality with attic conversions at second floor level. I am therefore satisfied that such accommodation need not be unacceptable in principle.
5. At the front the appeal scheme proposes, amongst other things, a new central gable with floor to ceiling window below. To my mind, the gable would interrupt the uniformity of the eaves of the front elevation, introducing a substantial and intrusive feature that would project upwards into the roofslope. The large central window at first floor level would be excessive in size, and disrupt the fenestration with other openings. Collectively these elements would be discordant and harmful to the character and appearance of the property.
6. Being at the rear, I am aware that the proposed extensions would have limited impact on the public domain. Nevertheless, the overall scale of the projecting element at second floor level would result in an extensive new roof form with a lower eaves and a ridgeline at the same level as the main house, and therefore lack any sense of subservience. Cumulatively the height, mass and bulk of the scheme at second floor level would appear dominant and anomalous when viewed from adjacent garden areas.

7. I am aware that the character of the neighbourhood is mixed in nature, that the site is not located in a conservation area and there are no listed buildings nearby. I am satisfied that the metal canopy to the front elevation reflects a more modern approach, and in my view this feature would integrate with the use of other contemporary materials. The Council does not appear to object to the small en-suite addition to the rear at first floor level, and I have no reason to disagree. Nonetheless, the development continues to be unacceptable for the reasons I have outlined above.
8. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It would fail to comply with Policies KP1, KP2 and CP4 of the Southend On Sea Core Strategy December 2007, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document July 2015 and the Design and Townscape Guide 2009. Taken in the round, these seek to ensure that developments respect the character and scale of the site and existing neighbourhood and maintain and enhances the character of residential areas. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR