



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/24/3339469

133 Blenheim Chase, Leigh-o-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 23/01903/FULH, dated 4 December 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extension with dormers to front and rear with Juliette balconies to rear to form habitable accommodation in the loft space, alter elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as "proposal for a hip-to-gable extension including two dormers, 2 roof lights and additional side facing windows". 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

The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, the streetscene and the area more widely.

Reasons

3. The appeal site 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. Blenheim Chase is a wide road, with 2 carriageways separated by a grass verge with trees. Each carriageway has 2 lanes. In particular the northern side of Blenheim Chase, where the site is situated, is characterised by hipped roof bungalows that have remained predominantly unaltered. There are a few examples in the area of bungalows that have been converted into chalet-style dwellings with habitable accommodation in the roof.
4. The starting point is the policies of the development plan. Policy DM3.4 of the Development Management Document specifically relates to the conversion of bungalows in the Borough and 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) Will not harm the balance of housing types evidenced as being essential to meet the needs of Southend's residents"*

5. There is nothing before me to suggest that the second criterion has relevance in this appeal. However, the thrust of the policy is to resist conversion of bungalows other than exceptionally, where the character and appearance of the area will not be harmed by a juxtaposition of features that stand out as being incongruous.
6. At present the appeal bungalow has a hipped main roof with a very short ridge running at right-angles to the road. Forward of the main roof, apparently as part of the original design, there is a projecting wing under a gabled roof, with a bay window, similar to neighbouring bungalows, although the bay window on the appeal dwelling has taken on a modern appearance. Alongside this are now 2 elements on the right, as viewed from the road. The first is a further substantial extension that comes forward as far as the bay window, again under a gabled roof, and forward of this, just off-centre, is a porch, also under a gable.
7. Thus there is a complex arrangement of 3 gables coming forward from the main hip roof. This presents as having an interesting and modern appearance which does not sit uncomfortably with the forward projecting gables of its neighbours on each side. From a normal eye view, the dwelling's hipped roof is something of a minor feature.
8. However, the proposed hip to gable would become quite dominant in the form of the bungalow. The ridge would run across the site, so that the gables would face the neighbouring dwellings. From being a minor, but appropriate feature, it would become a dominant and intrusive feature in the street scene, running counter to the present ensemble of features that I have described.
9. In addition the proposal includes a gabled dormer and 2 rooflights in the forward facing roof slope. This would add further features that conflict with the prevailing building form in the area, adding to the existing busy appearance from the public domain. The proposed rear box dormer, whilst it would not be visible from the highway, would impact on neighbouring properties which have relatively small rear gardens. This dormer would be of significant bulk, rising from just above the eaves to not far below the ridge, and would occupy most of the rear elevation of the roof. As such, it would fail to integrate with, or be a subservient addition, to a roof that would already be incompatible with the existing host dwelling.
10. The final matter raised in the officer's report is the proposed roof covering, which would be grey slate. This would clearly add to the unfortunate conflict with the character and appearance of the bungalows in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
11. For the appellant it is argued that the extensions would be subordinate to the host dwelling and would not adversely impact the integrity of the existing dwelling or streetscene, and that the external materials have been carefully selected and considered to match the host dwelling and complement the

design, character and appearance of the local area and townscape. However, these statements have not been supported by any detailed analysis; it will be clear that I do not find them persuasive, and that I disagree with them.

Conclusions

12. Having taken account of all matters raised, for the reasons that I have set out in paragraphs 6 to 10 above, the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR