



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2024

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/23/3331934

16A Cliff Parade, Leigh-on-Sea SS9 1AS

- 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 Lynda Robinson against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01029/FULH dated 16 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to half hip roof extension to side with dormer to front to form habitable accommodation in the loftspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development has been amended by the council during the determination of the application to reflect all aspects of the proposed development requiring planning permission. For accuracy, I have used the description of development on the decision notice.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the area and the Leigh Cliff Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. Cliff Parade is a residential street in the Leigh Cliff Conservation Area (CA) with a suburban character. The houses along it are elevated from the road and set back behind front gardens with views over the Thames estuary.
5. The significance of the Leigh Cliff CA is partly due to the group value of the late-19th and early-20th century houses which were built as the area grew as a resort.
6. The appeal property, No 16A is a two storey mid-terraced house with bay windows and hipped roof design which it shares with No 16B. It has been subject to some recent improvements which have resulted in the property making a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
7. Whilst its neighbour, No 16B was originally of a similar scale and design, it has historically undergone a number of less sympathetic alterations to its principal

- elevation. This has harmed the symmetry that would have existed between the pair.
8. Sections 69 and 72 of the Planning and Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act (1990) require me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of CAs.
 9. Policy DM1 (Design Quality) of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015) (DMD) requires development to add to the quality of an area through its design approach including scale, massing, height, form, materials and proportions.
 10. At para 2.49 of Policy DM3 (The Efficient and Effective Use of Land) of the DMD it states that '*a poorly designed addition can easily destroy the original character*' of a building and in so doing can harm the character of the wider area.
 11. Policy DM5 (Southend-on-Sea's Historic Environment) of the DMD requires new development in CA's to be of high quality which conserves and enhances its intrinsic character and distinctiveness.
 12. The Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) (SPD) provides guidance on extensions and alterations to dwellings. In particular, the SPD highlights that when extensions are proposed to buildings in a CA that the proposed design should be '*respectful of the scale of the present building – additions that are too large will be over dominant*'.
 13. The Framework, at paragraph 208 sets out that '*where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal...*'.
 14. The expansion of the roof to incorporate a partial hip would increase the height of the side gable wall of the host dwelling such that it would appear overbearing when viewed adjacent to its neighbour, No 16, where its ridge height is significantly lower. Coupled with the size of the dormer, which would add further vertical emphasis, I consider the overall design would result in harm to the host dwelling, street scene and less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA.
 15. Whilst I can see that the benefits of the proposed extensions would be of benefit to the appellant, these are not public benefits as such and would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA that I have identified.
 16. Overall, I consider the appeal proposals would offend policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the DMD as well as the relevant parts of the SPD, the Leigh Cliff Conservation Area Appraisal and the Framework.

Other Matters

17. I note from the appellant's statement that no neighbours have objected to the proposals. However, the absence of such objections can only be considered as a neutral factor in the overall planning balance.

Conclusions

18. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR