



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2023

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/23/3321246

133 Blenheim Chase, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3BX

- 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 Mrs Taslima Jahan Rupa against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00025/FULH, dated 7 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is erect single storey rear extension, single storey front/side extension and alter elevations (part-retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single storey rear extension, single storey front/side extension and alter elevations (part-retrospective) at 133 Blenheim Chase, Leigh-on-Sea, SS9 3BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00025/FULH, dated 7 January 2023, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as "proposal involves external alterations to the existing approved planning application reference: (21/01245/FULH)". The council changed this to the description used in the heading above, as did the appeal form. I have adopted it as it more clearly identifies the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed glazing to the front elevation on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene

Reasons

4. The application site is to the north of Blenheim Chase and is occupied by a detached bungalow that is within a row of similar detached dwellings. The surrounding area is residential in nature consisting mainly of semi-detached and detached bungalows.
5. The officer's report explains that the main difference between this development and that approved under 21/01245/FULH is the fenestration detailing to the front and rear extensions. Within the side and front extensions, full height

tinted glazing has been installed within two of the three enlargements, including into the gables. In addition, an existing bay window has been replaced with alternative style windows. Within the rear extension, a door to the rear has been installed in a similar position to the approved extension and a window as approved has been replaced with a smaller window and a door. The position of one rooflight within the extension has been altered.

6. It is clear that, in respect of the rear extension, the design, size, siting and scale of the development are such that it would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the site or the wider area. With regard to the front extension, and elevations changes, the size, siting and scale of the proposed development have previously been found to be acceptable. Therefore, the only controversial element of the scheme, as identified in the refusal notice, is the detail of the glazing that has already been installed.
7. The appeal property is one of 5 bungalows in a row that have similar front elevations, in as much as they have hipped roofs and forward gables. Three of the bungalows have the gables on the right hand side, whilst the appeal property and its neighbour to the right, have the gables on the left. The appeal dwelling has been altered quite markedly by having a permitted gable-roofed extension infilling to the right of the existing gable, and a forward projecting gabled porch. Thus the similarity in the design of the front elevations of the row has been largely broken. In addition, the forward gables of the neighbours have a variety of treatments, including plain white render, fancy bargeboards, vertical planted timber boards, and dark grey horizontal boarding with deep bargeboards of the same colour, and matching window frames. The last of these is the neighbouring bungalow, which is handed, so that the gables are side by side.
8. Seen in this context, the appeal dwelling stands out a being different because of the front extensions, but within a row that already has a variety of finishes and detail. The resulting look of the bungalow is certainly modern to a degree, but this is in the context of dwellings that are not of particular architectural value and, as I have already described, have a wide variety of features.
9. My conclusion is that the glazing to the front elevation that has been installed is suitable for and complementary to the appearance of the bungalow in its altered and extended form. It is not harmful to the character and appearance of the reconfigured front elevation, nor is it detrimental to the streetscene and the area more widely. I will therefore allow the appeal.

Conditions

10. Since the development has already been carried out, the statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development is not required. The council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. The suggested conditions require that the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building and that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
11. Clearly the first of these is inappropriate since the materials are in place and do not match those used in the existing building. I will incorporate the second suggested condition into the text of the permission since some of the

development that was permitted may not have been completed and this will provide certainty and avoid doubt as to the development permitted.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR