



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/21/3280695

27 Parkside, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 8PR

- 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 Roche against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00356/FULH, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is to raise the ridge height, form hip to gable roof extensions to front and rear with dormer to side to form habitable accommodation in roofspace, erect part single/part two storey side/rear extension with first floor balcony to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to raise the ridge height, form hip to gable roof extensions to front and rear with dormer to side to form habitable accommodation in roofspace, erect part single/part two storey side/rear extension with first floor balcony to rear at 27 Parkside, Westcliff-on-Sea, SS0 8PR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/00356/FULH, dated 15 January 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: 559/P101, 559/P102, 559/P104
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The windows in the east-facing first floor wall and the west-facing dormer hereby permitted shall be fitted with obscured glazing (to at least Level 4 on the Pilkington Levels of Privacy, or such equivalent as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority), and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 - 5) The first floor rear balcony hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until details of obscure glazed privacy screens to either side of the balcony have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved privacy screens shall be installed prior to the first use of the balcony and shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached, two-storey dwelling with off-street parking spaces to the front, sited on Parkside. The surrounding area is residential in nature with no prevailing architectural style; the neighbourhood is characterised by dwellings of various size, design and detailing. The overall trend is towards the evolution of building form and appearance through the extension of houses over the years.
4. Although the scheme would result in an increase in built form at both first and second floor levels, I am of the view that the alterations would not be harmful to the scale and proportions of the existing property. The side extension over the existing garage would be set away from the common boundary, and as such would not appreciably erode the sense of spaciousness to the adjacent house. The proposed dormer window would be positioned centrally within the flank roofslope, behind the chimney stack to further reduce its prominence, and include a pitched roof that would visually connect with the overall appearance of the dwelling.
5. I saw at my site visit the considerable variety in the appearance of houses in the area, including myriad roof shapes and styles. I also note the differences in space separation between properties at first and second floor level, many of which would reflect those proposed in this instance. Within this context, to my mind the extensions would harmonise with the surrounds and respect the spatial quality of the area.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would meet the provisions 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 and the Design and Townscape Guide 2009. Cumulatively these policies seek to ensure new development is well-designed and maintains and enhances the character of an area. 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.
9. A condition would be necessary, in the interests of visual amenity, to ensure external materials match those used on the existing building. Obscure glazing to the first floor windows in the east-facing wall and the west-facing dormer would prevent adverse overlooking over the rear garden areas and patios of

the adjacent dwellings fronting Chadwick Road, and therefore protect the living conditions of the occupants. I do not consider it necessary to require obscure glazing to the east-facing rooflight, as this would afford a view primarily over the blank roof slope of the adjacent dwelling and would not be likely to result in a loss of privacy.

10. To safeguard the living conditions of neighbours I have imposed a condition in respect of proposed privacy screens to the rear balcony. I do not consider it necessary to restrict the adjacent flat roof areas for amenity purposes, as the screens themselves will prevent reasonable access and the roofs also contain skylights that would limit their use.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR