



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/24/3349654

69 Parkanaur Avenue, Thorpe Bay, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3JA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Thornton against the decision of Southend on Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00512/FULH.
 - The development proposed is described as a rear extension, front extension, new roof with dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear extension, front extension, new roof with dormers at 69 Parkanaur Avenue, Thorpe Bay, Southend-on-Sea SS1 3JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00512/FULH, subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, MA208-001, MA208-002 Rev B, MA208-003 Rev B and MA208-004 Rev B.
 - 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 building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site, street scene and wider area.

Reasons

5. The properties in the area vary in type, size, architectural styles and host varying roof forms. On this side of the street the appeal property, which is a bungalow, is sited between and within a row of two-storey houses. The appeal property, being a bungalow, is out of character within the context of the development either side of it.
6. The proposal seeks to increase the height of the dwelling and alter its roof form to create accommodation within the roof slope. The resulting appearance of the dwelling would be more akin to a chalet style bungalow. I accept that the proposed development would not represent a subservient extension of the original building and note that alterations to the bungalow are of concern to a local Councillor.
7. The proposal would create a dwelling with a ridge running front to rear with a lower roof with a ridge running side on. This would not be an unconventional roof form in this locality.
8. The design and sizing of the fenestration proposed to the front elevation at ground and first floor is of modern design. To the front the windows at ground floor would have a uniform appearance. The larger first floor window would be both centrally located within the gable and in its positioning above a ground floor window. Although large this first floor window would sit comfortably within the eaves of the front roof gable. The glazed entrance porch would be a feature entrance to the property, as is commonplace for residential properties. The roof lights are small and would not make a significant impact to the appearance of the frontage of the property.
9. Given the varied context of the architectural styles and differing roof forms of the development within the area, I do not find that the proposed development would appear unduly prominent, unusual or substantially out of keeping with this street scene. Furthermore, I do not find that the glazing would appear out of proportion or lack cohesion and alignment.
10. To the rear there would be more variation to the roof forms and less cohesion to the fenestration. Whilst this would be so, the mixture of roof slopes and flat roofed element, along with the mis-alignment of fenestration would not be so inconsistent that it would be visually harmful.
11. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the site, street scene and wider area. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy 2007, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document 2015, the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide 2009, the National Design Guide 2021 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other matters, development to 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 with alterations to a building making a positive contribution to the character of the original building and the surrounding area.

Conditions

12. I have considered the planning conditions put forward by the Council in light of paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to

the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the visual interests of the locality a condition requiring matching materials is necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and subject to the conditions listed, this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR