



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/21/3280241

137 Parkanaur Avenue, Thorpe Bay SS1 3JD

- 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 Axcell against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01101/FULH, dated 22 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is to erect a part single/part two storey side extension with first floor terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to erect a part single/part two storey side extension with first floor terrace at 137 Parkanaur Avenue, Thorpe Bay SS1 3JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/01101/FULH, dated 22 May 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: P01, P04/C, P05/B
 - 3)The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.

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 site relates to a detached property in a residential area on the outskirts of Southend-on-Sea. There is no prevailing architectural style; the locality is characterised by dwellings of various size, appearance and detailing.
 4. From the front, it is my view that the dimensions and use of matching materials would ensure that the development would visually connect with the existing property, without dominating it. The front dormer would be of an appropriate size and design, and would sit comfortably within the roof slope. The single storey element along the boundary would be barely perceptible from the public domain in the gap between the dwellings, and would not appreciably add to the bulk of the scheme.
-

5. At the rear, I note the existing arrangement of the neighbouring house at 135 Parkanaur Avenue, with a flat roof single storey rear extension, first floor dormer element, balcony and privacy screen. Within this context, I consider that the proposal would not appear incongruous. Moreover, the various elements would be subservient to the existing ridge lines and would not project beyond the existing first floor rear gable. As such, they would have a limited impact when viewed from surrounding garden areas.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. Consequently, it would comply with the requirements of policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy December 2007, policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's Development Management Document 2015 (DMD) and the Design and Townscape Guide 2009. These policies seek to ensure the design of development should be satisfactory and respect the scale, appearance and location of buildings. The appeal scheme would also be consistent with the advice in the National Planning Policy Framework which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

7. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. I have altered the wording of some of the conditions suggested by the Council in the interests of clarity and necessity.
8. In addition to the standard implementation condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted drawings is reasonable and necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A further condition would be necessary, in the interests of visual amenity, to ensure external materials match those used on the existing building.

Conclusion

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

C Hall

INSPECTOR