
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019

by AJ Steen BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/W/19/3221512

8 Louise Road, Rayleigh SS6 8LW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Lee against Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01075/FUL, is dated 2 November 2018.
 - The development proposed was described as "extension of rear dormers."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council has confirmed that had it determined the planning application it would have been refused. The Council's concerns relate to the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.
3. I note that the description of development was altered following submission of the appeal to include a ground floor extension across the rear of the property. I have not amended the description of development in my header above. I note that the Council have not raised concerns regarding the ground floor extension and I see no reason to disagree with their conclusions in this regard.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 8 Louise Road is a semi-detached chalet bungalow located within a residential area comprising a mix of dwellings including semi-detached and detached chalet bungalows and two storey houses. The existing dwelling has a dormer across most of its width. The attached dwelling has a similar dormer linked to that at no. 8, with a gable ended first floor extending over the rear extension to the opposite side of the building from no. 8.
6. The proposal would extend the existing dormer away from the rear of the dwelling part of the way over the existing ground floor extension. The location of the proposed dormer to the rear means that it would not be visible other than in glimpsed views through the gap between the existing dwelling and the

detached neighbour and from surrounding rear gardens. Whilst this is a discrete location, the proposal would result in a large and bulky flat roofed extension, albeit with a small pitch to the rear. It would have the appearance of a large flat roofed two storey extension that would dominate the rear of the building. It would contrast with the character and appearance of the gable ended first floor on the adjoining property. As a result, it would appear incongruous.

7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal would conflict with Policy CP1 of the Rochford District Council Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy and Policy DM1 of the LDF Development Management Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework that seek good high quality design that promotes the character of the locality and positively contributes to the surrounding built environment.
8. I note the appellants wish to provide space for their growing family. This is not an uncommon scenario and, while I have sympathy to the circumstances described, they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm and policy conflict identified.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the development plan. Thus, having had regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

AJ Steen

INSPECTOR