



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/23/3316331

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 22/02303/FULH, dated 28 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is erect two-storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two-storey side/rear extension at 2 Gleneagles Road, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 4QA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/02303/FULH, dated 28 November 2022, subject to the following conditions
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 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-D - Existing & Proposed Floor, roof, site, location plans & elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling

Procedural matters

2. The planning application form described the development as 'First floor/two-storey side extension amended proposal'. The officer's report, the decision notice and the appeal form all described it as 'Erect two storey side/rear extension (amended proposal)'. Clearly the 'amended proposal' part of the description does not serve to add to the description of the operation development proposed, and therefore should be omitted. I have adopted the description as shown in the heading above from the 3 documents just mentioned, since this accurately describes what is proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the appearance of the host dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour, and on the character and appearance of the streetscene and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a 2-storey semi-detached house, situated at the junction of Gleneagles Road with Moor Park Gardens. The surrounding area consists of detached and semi-detached dwellings, varying in scale, form and design.
5. There have been 2 previous proposals for similar extensions, both refused. The second of these applications went to appeal, under reference APP/D1590/D/22/3310492. I have been provided with a copy of that decision. The scope of the development in this current appeal is similar to the earlier proposal, but has been reduced in height and depth. The officer's report confirms that the appeal proposal is subservient in appearance to the host dwelling, but judged that, because of its prominent corner location, it would be unduly dominant and incongruous, bringing an imbalance to the pair of semi-detached houses.
6. My fellow Inspector in the previous appeal noted that: *"although semi-detached, the pair of properties 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"*. Taking account of this, that Inspector concluded 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. That Inspector concluded that *"It would accord with Southend Core Strategy 2007 Policies KP2 and CP4, 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;"*.
7. Whilst I have not seen the plans for the previous proposal, the officer's report describes the current proposal as having been reduced in height by 0.86m and set back from the main front elevation by an additional 3.12m at first floor level. The plans before me show that first floor element is set well back from the front elevation of the house, with the ridge of its gabled roof well below the main roof. The ground floor part of the side extension retains its hipped roof form, so that the whole marries well. The extensions would be constructed in brick and tiles to match the existing building.

Conclusion

8. I consider that the development now proposed is as satisfactory, if not more so, as that which the Inspector allowed on the previous appeal. In consequence I consider that the proposed development would be acceptable in terms of its effect on the appearance of the host dwelling and its semi-detached neighbour, and on the character and appearance of the streetscene and the wider area. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Conditions

9. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, I will add conditions specifying the drawing number on which I have based my decision, for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted, and requiring the materials to be used

match the existing, to ensure that the appearance of the development permitted integrates with the existing house in a visually satisfactory manner.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR