



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: 22nd January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/24/3350260

72 Woodside, Leigh-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea SS9 4RB

- 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 J Harvey against the decision of Southend on Sea Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00617/FULH.
 - The development proposed is described as extension to the front, side and rear of existing bungalow and extend to first floor and with second floor accommodation in the roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. My discussion below makes reference to No. 74 Woodside. Refusal reason 2 on the Council's decision notice refers to No.72 Woodside. However, No. 72 is the appeal property. The Council officers report makes it clear that the living conditions considerations pertain to No. 74 Woodside. It appears the reference to No. 72 within refusal reason 2 has been a typographical error.
4. 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 Issues

5. The main issues raised by this appeal are the effect of the proposed development upon the the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at No.74 Woodside and the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

6. There would be separation between the development and the western boundary of the site, along with separation between this boundary and the main side flank elevation of No.74 Woodside. However, the two-storey rear extension would be of substantial height and project a considerable distance beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property, No.74.

7. The occupiers of neighbouring properties should reasonably expect to enjoy an acceptable outlook as part of their residential lives. The two-storey extension would create a development of significant size and height in close proximity to No.74. The resulting two storey rear projection would be extremely dominant in the outlook from the rear habitable living space within the neighbouring property, as well as from their outdoor living space at the rear of the dwelling. The visually overbearing impact of this addition in such close proximity to the adjoining property, despite there being some separation between the respective developments, would diminish the enjoyment of the residential living environment for the neighbouring occupiers. This would harm the enjoyment the existing occupiers should reasonably expect to enjoy.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers at No.74 Woodside. As such, the proposed development would conflict 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 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development protects the amenities of immediate neighbours.
9. I have been referred to a previous planning permission pertaining to this site relating to the demolition of the existing chalet bungalow and erection of a dwelling house (Planning Ref: 19/02008/FUL). I have been provided with the Council's report relating to that proposal and plans. From the information provided it appears to me that that two-storey development would not project beyond the rear building line of No.74 to the extent that is proposed here. Therefore, the proposal before me can and should be considered on its own merits.

Character and appearance

10. The properties in the area vary in type, size and architectural styles. To this side of the street the appeal property is sited within a mix of two-storey houses and chalet bungalows, although there are a small number of bungalows interspersed further along the street.
11. The proposal would significantly alter the size of the property and its appearance. It would create a dwelling of two-storey appearance. Other properties along this side of the street host two-storey front projections. There is variety to the palette of material used within the dwellings in the area. The creation of a larger dwelling would make it more noticeable within the street scene. Nonetheless, given the variety of heights, sizes and architectural styles of the existing development along this street scene I do not find that the proposed development would appear overly dominant or out of keeping within this street scene. Furthermore, I do not consider the use of cladding within the elevations would appear significantly out of keeping.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the 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 the Framework 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.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I have found in favour of the appellant in terms of the second main issue, this does not overcome the identified harm in relation to the first main issue.
14. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR