



Appeal Decision

Site visit made of 4 January 2022 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Hollie Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3284564

237 Prittlewell Chase, Westcliff-On-Sea SS0 0PP

- 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 Matthew & Mrs Sarah Harding against the decision of Southend-On-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01491/FULH, dated 12 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a part single/ part 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. In the interest of accuracy, the description of development in the header above is based on the appeal form.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring occupants of Nos. 235 and 233 Prittlewell Chase with regards to overlooking and a loss of privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling located at the corner of the junction of Prittlewell Chase and Eastbourne Grove within a narrow rectangular plot. A large, pitched roof annexe building sits at the rear end of the garden. The surrounding area is mostly residential and is characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings as well as a few bungalows. It is a verdant area with neighbouring properties featuring small flat-roofed outbuildings and sheds within landscaped gardens with mature vegetation.
-

6. Whilst the proposed first-floor rear extension would have a pitched roof and feature matching materials to the existing dwelling, it would add considerable mass and visual bulk to the property within what is a relatively small and narrow plot. When viewed in conjunction with the considerably large outbuilding within the garden, the proposed development would appear excessively bulky and dominant in light of its considerable depth and double-storey height. It would reduce the garden space and result in a perceivably overdeveloped plot which would be out of character with the surrounding context.
7. The appeal dwelling also occupies a prominent corner plot and therefore the development would appear prominently within the street scene. It would constitute an incongruous and discordant addition to the appeal dwelling which would adversely impact the open and verdant character of the area.
8. Given the above, the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Council's Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015) (DMD) which collectively seek to ensure developments are well-designed and respect local context. For similar reasons, the proposal would also fail to adhere to design guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
9. I do not find that Policy KP1 of the Core Strategy, referred to by the Council, is relevant to the proposal as it is a wide strategic policy concerned with regeneration, the Green Belt and flood risk.

Living Conditions

10. The plans indicate that the proposed side window located within the eastern elevation of the first-floor rear extension would be obscure glazed. In light of this, there would be no adverse overlooking towards the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties at Nos. 235 and 233 Prittlewell Chase.
11. Given the above, the development would not adversely impact the living conditions of the occupiers of 235 and 233 Prittlewell Chase with regards to overlooking and a loss of privacy. It would therefore not conflict with Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the DMD which together seek to ensure developments do not adversely affect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.
12. Policy KP2 of the Core Strategy is not entirely relevant to the scheme as it does not relate to the impact of a development on the living conditions of surrounding occupants.

Recommendation

13. The development would not negatively affect the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers at Nos. 235 and 233 Prittlewell Chase with regards to overlooking, but would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

14. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR