

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31ST march 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/21/3288324

227 Woodside, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 4TB

- 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 Thomas Cronin against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01882/FULH, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side extension together with loft conversion erection of dormer to the rear roof and roof lights to the front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with an 'L-shaped' footprint and occupying a corner plot on the inside of a bend where Woodside turns through 90-degrees. It sits within a wider, residential neighbourhood with a mix of dwelling types, many of repeat designs and many that have been altered beyond their original form in a variety of ways. Notwithstanding, there is a pleasing sense of space and openness to the vistas along Woodside that is derived from the buildings being set back from their respective road frontages and which contributes to the distinctive character of the area.
4. The proposal would extend the property sideways, towards the side return boundary along Woodside and with a rear dormer addition that would facilitate conversion of the loft space into habitable accommodation.
5. Nos 227 and 229 are a semi-detached pair that would originally have been symmetrical. No 229 has altered its side hipped roof to a gable and constructed a 'box-like' dormer to the rear elevation. There is no longer any symmetry to

the pair and therefore the sideways extension to No 227 would not detract from the appearance of the building in this regard.

6. The proposal would simply project the dwelling sideways but in a recessed form that would appear slightly subservient to the original and which would follow a logical progression. It would appear well-suited and integrated with the original dwelling, in accord with the advice contained at paragraph 10.2.2 of the Council's *Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2009* (SPD). Notwithstanding, it would encroach to within about 1m of the plot's side return boundary. At present, the flank wall of No 227 approximately follows the forward building lines of the semi-detached bungalows at Nos 215-225 (odd) that expand eastwards, away from the appeal site. This alignment is consistent with the character of the wider area and contributes to its spacious qualities. The side extension would significantly reduce the space to the side of No 227 and would noticeably breach an established building line to this part of Woodside.
7. Due to the location of No 227, the rear elevation of the dwelling is open to exposed views from Woodside when approaching the site from the east. Because of this, the dormer would be highly visible in the public realm, unlike many others. Contrary to the appellant's view, I find that it would be a prominent rather than incidental addition that would obscure virtually the whole expanse of original roof slope, altering the profile of the building in a manner that would show little respect for its architectural style. This would conflict with the advice at paragraph 366 of the SPD, as quoted by the appellant, and would add further to the intrusive and harmful impact of the proposal upon the street scene. Furthermore, based on my own observations, it would also be deeper than the dormer on the attached property, encroaching closer to the eaves of the building, and with a void to solid ratio that would appear unbalanced due to the size and position of the window openings.
8. Overall, for the reasons given, due to its proximity to the southern boundary of the site, and the size and design of the rear dormer, I find that the proposal would harm the appearance of No 227 and would unacceptably narrow the vista within the street scene with a built form that would appear incongruous and visually intrusive. As such it would conflict with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy 2007 and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's Development Management Document 2015 insofar as they all seek to ensure new development respects and maintains the character of an area by responding positively to local context. In this regard there would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.
9. I appreciate that there were no objections to the proposal expressed by any third parties, but this does not alter my findings. Accordingly, for the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR