
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3284646

82 Thorndon Park Drive, Leigh-On-Sea, Essex SS9 4RQ

- 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 Ms Helen Davis against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01103/FULH was refused by notice dated 19 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is to erect roof extension and install dormers to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the streetscene and wider locality.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a primarily residential area surrounded by predominately single-storey dwellings of moderate scale. These are mostly hipped-roof detached and semi-detached properties. The modest scale and design of the properties make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider area. Within this area of Thorndon Park Drive front and rear dormers are not a characteristic of the area.
 4. The appeal property is a single-storey detached dwelling with a hipped pitched roof. The proposal includes the formation of a part hipped and gabled roof with two pitched roof dormers to the front and a flat roof rear dormer. The ridge height would remain unaltered, but the roof extensions would be required to accommodate the proposed dormers.
 5. Guidance in paragraph 370 in the Southend on Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) recognises that in some cases it may be possible to change a hipped roof to a gable end. However, this should not be out of character with the streetscene.
-

6. From my observations, due to the scale and design of the proposed front dormers together with the roof side extensions, they would significantly dominate the host dwelling. The existing character and appearance of the dwelling would be unacceptably eroded. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling, the streetscene and wider locality.
7. Whilst I only viewed from public viewpoints, it is quite clear that the proposed rear dormer of 7.8 metres in width, in addition to the front dormers and roof side extensions would unacceptably dominate the modest scale of the existing dwelling. Although the rear dormer would not dominate public viewpoints, it would be visible from neighbouring properties. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding rear garden area.
8. In reaching my conclusion I have had regard to all matters raised including the Lawful Development Certificate 21/00280/CLP for a part hipped and gable roof, rooflights to the front and rear dormers. This is a material fallback consideration. Nevertheless, whilst the side roof extensions would be the same as that allowed under permitted development, the proposal before me would be significantly larger than the permitted development fallback position and front rooflights are less obtrusive than the proposed front dormers. Therefore, in reaching my conclusion, I have attributed limited weight to the fallback position.
9. For the reasons stated above I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the streetscene and wider locality. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in the Design and Townscape Guide (2009). In addition, it would be contrary to Policies KP2 and CP4 in the Southend on Sea Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 in the Southend on Sea Development Management Document (2015), particularly where they seek to ensure that new development is good quality, respects the character and scale of the neighbourhood and, for extensions, makes a positive contribution to the character of the original building.
10. Since the Council made its decision on this proposal, national policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) has been replaced by a revised National Planning Policy Framework (2021). The above policies are broadly consistent with the Framework, especially where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR