



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/22/3296892

33 Lonsdale Road, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 4LY

- 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 James Scaife against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00179/FULH, dated 4 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 1 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is to erect first floor side extension with pitched roof and extend existing roof dormer to rear, erect single storey rear extension and alter side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor side extension and the roof dormer to the rear.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 33 Lonsdale Road, Southend-on-Sea, SS2 4LY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00179/FULH, dated 4 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Site Plan and Proposed Roof Layout (ref. J.G.S.3), Proposed Ground Floor Plan (ref. J.G.S.2) and Existing and Proposed Elevations Plan (ref. J.G.S.1 Revision A), insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension.

Appeal Procedure

3. 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.

Main Issue

4. There is no objection to the widening of the rear dormer or to the single storey rear extension. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The host dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a single storey wrap around side and rear extension. Whilst it is of a similar design to the adjoining semi-detached pair, the dwellings on the street exhibit a variety of architectural styles, some of which are detached, semi-detached and within groups of terraces. Generally, the dwellings in the locality are closely spaced, creating a dense urban character to the area.
6. The proposed side extension would be at first-floor level and would follow the alignment of the front and side elevation of the existing side extension. The pitched roof would integrate into the existing roof of the host dwelling and be of matching materials. Although the setback from the existing roof level and the main front elevation of the host dwelling would be modest, it would enable the proposed side extension to be read as an extension. Together with its relatively modest width in comparison with the scale of the host dwelling, the proposed side extension would appear as a subservient addition. This would accord with the provisions of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 1: Design and Townscape Guide (2009) in this respect. Therefore, the scale and bulk of the proposed side extension would not be unduly dominant or visually discordant when viewed from the street.
7. The proposed side extension would result in a loss of a gap between the host dwelling and neighbouring detached dwelling at first-floor and at roof level. Whilst the proposed side extension would extend to the boundary, the adjacent detached dwelling is separated from the host dwelling by a passageway. A narrow degree of separation would therefore be maintained between the proposed side extension and the neighbouring dwelling. This would reflect the size of the gap between the detached dwellings at No.27 and No.29/31 and the general pattern of development in the vicinity.
8. Owing to the varied street scene, which includes short terraces, the proposed side extension would neither disrupt the pattern of development nearby nor appear at odds with the character and appearance of the area. Given this, I am not persuaded that the loss of gap from the proposed side extension would give rise to a terracing effect that would be out of character of the area. As such, the proposed side extension would be in line with the SPD regarding terracing effects.
9. However, the National Planning Policy Framework promotes high quality design that is visually attractive and the development plan also seeks good quality design. Furthermore, the SPD indicates that original design qualities should be preserved. The fenestration in the front elevation has been altered from a previous scheme and the Council has no objection in this respect. However, the first-floor window would not reflect or align horizontally with the immediately adjoining first-floor window in the host dwelling. As a result, an odd, rather than harmonious, appearance would result. The design would be poor and so would significantly detract from the street scene. Therefore, because of its design the proposed side extension would harm the character and appearance

of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015). Collectively, these policies seek good quality design that that contributes positively to the character of the original building and area.

10. However, the rear extension would be modest in scale and massing relative to the host dwelling and would not extend beyond the building line of the neighbouring detached dwelling of No.29/31. It would accord with relevant development plan policies and is acceptable.

Other Matters

11. The appellant is critical of the Council in that no feedback has been given as to what is required to achieve a setback and what would be considered subservient. Nevertheless, I have had to assess the impact of the appeal proposal itself.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard conditions requiring a time limit for commencement of development and adherence to the approved plans, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing building is necessary to achieve a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that in relation to the proposed single storey rear extension, the appeal is allowed. However, I have found that the front elevation fenestration of the proposed side extension would conflict with the development plan and the Framework in terms of design quality and there are no other material considerations that outweigh this finding. In relation to the proposed side extension and rear roof dormer, which is physically dependent on the side extension, I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension but is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first-floor side extension and rear roof dormer.

David Smith

INSPECTOR