



---

## 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: 24 May 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/23/3318476**

**160 Woodside, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 4TQ**

- 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 Paul Tredgold against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
  - The application Ref 22/02161/FULH, dated 6 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is raise ridge height of main roof, hipped to half hipped roof extensions and dormer to side to form habitable accommodation in the loft space, alter elevations.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the streetscene and the surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling, No.160, is a detached L-shaped bungalow located on the west side of Woodside. It occupies a corner plot on the junction with Belfairs Park Drive. At present, No.160 has a forward projecting wing under a hipped roof, running out from a higher roofed element, also hipped but with a short ridge running at right-angles to the projecting element. Behind these there is another lower element with a hipped roof, projecting into the rear garden.
4. The appeal proposal is to slightly raise the ridge height of this rear projection, but leave it as single-storey. Forward of this, a first floor would be erected running forward to cover the central section of the dwelling and part of the existing front wing. This 2-storey element would have a ridge running from front to back, with half-hips at front and rear.
5. The surrounding area consists of detached and semi-detached houses and bungalows in varying designs. The majority of dwellings in this area have hipped roofs, with their ridges running at right-angles to the road. There are 1 or 2 examples of gabled roofs, such as that almost opposite the appeal site, in that case with its ridge running parallel to the road. The flank elevation of

- No.160 fronts onto a short cul-de-sac extension of Belfairs Park Drive, at a point where there is a small 'crank' in Woodside.
6. This position is significant in terms of the form and scale of properties because, for some distance to the north, the neighbours to the appeal site are all 2-storey houses, whereas to the south, beyond the cul-de-sac and crank in the road, there is a long run of bungalows, albeit that there are examples of accommodation being formed in roofs. This is important to the extent that the juxtaposition of the appeal bungalow with the houses, and the downward slope of the road to the south, amounts to a rather abrupt change of scale. I also noted at my site visit that, to the south a little distance away, there are examples of half-hipped roofs, but these are in a length of the road where there is some variety of roof types including gables and changes in ridge orientation.
  7. Local development plan policies, set out in the Core Strategy (2007) and Development Management Document (2015), supplemented by Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009), seek to ensure that new development is well designed. Development should add to the overall quality of the area and respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings, provide appropriate detailing that contributes to and enhances the distinctiveness of place; and contributes positively to the public realm. In particular, Policy DM1 of the Development Management Document states that all development should; "*add to the overall quality of the area and respect the character of the site, its local context and surroundings in terms of its architectural approach, height, size, scale, form, massing, density, layout, proportions, materials, townscape and/or landscape setting, use, and detailed design features*". These policies accord with the emphasis on good design in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
  8. Policy DM3.4 of the Development Management Document specifically relates to the conversion of bungalows in the City and it states that: "*The conversion or redevelopment of single storey dwellings (bungalows) will generally be resisted. Exceptions will be considered where the proposal:*  
(i) *Does not create an unacceptable juxtaposition within the streetscene that would harm the character and appearance of the area; or (ii)*" [not applicable here].
  9. I have set out a description of the immediate surroundings of the appeal property in paragraphs 5 and 6 above. Taking that into account, the added height as proposed would provide a more satisfactory termination to the run of 2-storey houses to the north, which would be a gain in streetscape terms. However, I have concluded that the half-hip to the front elevation is unsatisfactory in this context, because of the extent that it would jar in comparison with the dominant roof form in the immediate area. This would be emphasised by the fact that the appeal bungalow is situated at the end of the run of 2-storey houses. The unsatisfactory nature of the half-hip roof also shows in the flank elevation onto the cul-de-sac part of Belfairs Park Drive, which would stand out on the approach to the junction, particularly from the south. The proposed development would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling, the streetscene and the wider area.
  10. I have taken account of all other matters, including the various paragraphs from the Framework quoted on behalf of the appellant. In my view, important

as they are as a generality, paragraphs 38, 56, 119, 120, 121, 124, and 125, are mostly not in contention, and are not directly helpful in reaching a decision in this case. Paragraphs 126 and 130 which are also drawn to my attention, underlying the importance of good design, are particularly germane to my decision.

11. For the reasons that I have given, I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the streetscene, and the surrounding area, such that permission should be refused. I will therefore dismiss the appeal.

*Terrence Kemmann-Lane*

INSPECTOR