
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: 31st January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3285927

64 Canterbury Avenue, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS2 4QL

- 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 Grant Dennison against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01587/FULH was refused by notice dated 4 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-story side extension set back from the original house. The roof will be same angle and height as the original house to front and rear as to accommodate the solar panels (other houses in area have side extensions level with the original house). The original house has had 100mm insulation and a render finish, painted in sandstone brown under permitted development. The side extension will have rendered finish painted in sandstone brown same as the house (Other houses have render and pebble dash finish in area). The windows will be wooden framed windows and same pattern as neighbours.
-

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 on a prominent corner location in a predominately residential area. Dwellings are mostly of traditional design with traditional framed windows, where there is sub-division of the glazing of most of the main windows and cills are positioned under the windows. Whilst there is some variation in design, the overall appearance of the surrounding area is of a traditional character.
 4. The side extension has been substantially completed. The Council has only raised concern regarding the proposed fenestration. At the time of my visit some windows had vertical mullions with wooden window frames and a first floor window in the original part of the dwelling had a raised wooden frame attached to the edges. The other front first floor window in the original part of the dwelling has not been removed. The proposal includes wood framed
-

- windows. The windows are triple glazed and the proposal includes these large panes being subdivided on the outside of the glass.
5. Guidance in the Southend on Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) explains that alterations to existing buildings should not destroy existing character and that even minor changes, such as changing the window design, can be detrimental.
 6. From my observations, even with wooden frames and subdivision, the windows would still appear as incongruous and contrived additions in this prominent corner location. They would still appear as large panes of glass, rather than individual panes. From the information before me, the windows would be unconvincing and have little architectural merit and would be an unacceptable addition to the streetscene. They would not be in keeping with the traditional character and appearance of the original dwelling, the streetscene and wider locality.
 7. The appellant has suggested revisions to the proposal, including the provision of cills and re-instating other windows. These details are not before me. Therefore, I have not taken them into consideration in my determination of this appeal.
 8. I note the environmental benefits of the triple glazing. This is a material consideration. Nevertheless, this does not overcome the harm I have identified above.
 9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all other matters raised including an Appeal Decision Ref APP/D1590/D/20/3258560. Whilst reaching a similar conclusion, I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits.
 10. For the above reasons, 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 Southend on Sea 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. The above policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, especially where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR