

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2017

by **R J Maile BSc FRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27th April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/17/3167217

48 Bohemia Chase, Leigh-on-Sea, Essex, SS9 4PP.

- 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 Mr Oliver Manning against the decision of Southend-on-Sea Borough Council.
 - The application ref: 16/01837/FULH, dated 3 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with dormers to front and rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the impact of the proposed dormer windows upon the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. This property comprises one of a pair of modest, semi-detached bungalows. It is located within an area of similar dwellings, many of which have been the subject of alterations and extensions including hip to gable conversions and the addition of dormer windows of various designs.
 4. I see no objection to the creation of additional accommodation within the roof void or the principle of a hip to gable extension and the use of front and rear dormers. I also acknowledge the benefit of a catslide roof dormer to the front roof slope similar to others that I noted close by. In some cases, these relate to semi-detached properties where only one of the pair of dwellings has been altered. As such I see no reason to withhold consent upon this issue, subject to the use of more appropriately scaled dormers.
 5. The dormer windows as indicated on the submitted drawings are excessive in terms of their overall size and bulk and fail to respect detailed guidance as set
-

out in the Council's SPD¹ at paragraph 366, which requires dormer windows to be incidental to the roof slope. In this case the dormers are insufficiently inset from the side wall and, as a result, represent discordant and bulky additions to this modest semi-detached bungalow.

6. I appreciate the desire of the appellant to extend the property to accommodate his young family. Nevertheless, this should not be at the expense of an incongruous addition to the bungalow utilising large dormer windows which are unsympathetic to the host building.
7. I have therefore found upon the main issue that the detailed scheme before me would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and that of the surrounding area. As such, development as proposed would be contrary to national guidance at Chapter 7 (Requiring good design) of the Framework², to Policies KP2 and CP4 of the adopted Core Strategy³, Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Document⁴ and advice contained within the Council's SPD1 referred to above.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

R. J. Maile

INSPECTOR

¹ The Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Local Development Framework - Supplementary Planning Document 1: Design and Townscape Guide 2009.

² The National Planning Policy Framework.

³ The Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Local Development Framework - Core Strategy: December 2007.

⁴ The Southend-on-Sea Borough Council Local Planning Framework – Development Management Document: July 2015.