
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/22/3310492

2 Gleneagles Road, LEIGH-ON-SEA, SS9 4QA

- 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 Steve Butfield against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref. 22/01393/FULH, dated 7 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is first floor/two-storey side extension amended proposal.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor/two-storey side extension at 2 Gleneagles Road, LEIGH-ON-SEA, SS9 4QA, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref. 22/01393/FULH, dated 7 July 2022, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 3857-03-C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the main building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form a slightly different wording has been entered, but as the parties have not provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed I have used the one given on the original application. However, I have omitted reference to 'amended proposal' from the formal decision, as this does not describe development within the terms of the Planning Acts.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within a mixed residential area of dwelling styles. It is prominently located on the corner of a road junction, and has a single-storey side extension that links into a pitched roof front canopy. Although semi-detached, the pair of properties of which it forms part have a staggered roof line due to the ground levels. This combined with the side extension on the appeal property and different canopy styles means that the pair already differ in appearance, and any sense of symmetry is reasonably limited.
5. The boundary tapers slightly, such that the front of the existing side extension is closer to it than the rear of the dwelling. The building is nevertheless set away from the boundary and the adjacent footpath. Within the wider area the treatment of corner sites differs, and whilst some properties retain generous side gaps, others have extended closer to their boundaries. A sense of space in the street scene is therefore derived more from front gardens.
6. Policy DM3 of the Southend Development Management Document 2015 (DMD) requires additions to buildings to make a positive contribution to the character of the original building and the surrounding area by adopting a scale that is respectful and subservient. This is reflected in the advice in the published Design and Townscape Guide¹ (DTG), that side extensions should be designed to appear subservient to the parent building, and that this can generally be achieved by setting the extension back behind the existing building frontage line and fully integrating the design.
7. The Council does not oppose the principle of extending the dwelling or the proposed proximity to the boundary. My attention has not been drawn to any policy or guideline which specifies minimum recesses or set down from the roofline to achieve subservience; indeed, I saw a similar extension within a short walking distance of the site², which was identified by the appellant. In this context, I consider that the proposal would appear subservient to the host house as a result of its size, scale and articulated design. It would be proportionate to the width of the main dwelling and the overall design would appear integrated. The separation from the side boundary would avoid the development appearing unduly dominant or incongruous in the street scene.
8. The symmetry of the semi-detached pair of which the property forms part is already reduced by the existing extension and staggered height, and this proposal would not undermine the character and appearance of the pair.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in its effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and the wider area. It would accord with Southend Core Strategy 2007 Policies KP2 and CP4, to create a high quality urban environment; and with DMD Policies DM3 and DM1, which amongst other criteria requires development that adds to the overall quality of the area and respects the character of the site, its local context and surroundings in matters including architectural approach, height, size, scale, form and massing; and with guidance in the DTG.

¹ Supplementary Planning Document 1 Design and Townscape Guide 2009

² At 1 Great Hays – application ref. 15/00979/FULH

10. For the same reasons, the proposal would accord with the requirements in the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved plan as this provides certainty. The proposal is to render both the extension and the main house, which is currently finished in brick and tile hanging. I have therefore attached a condition to ensure that the extension materials match those of the main dwelling, as opposed to 'existing', in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR