



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons)

Decision by J Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/19/3238380

1 Hillview Road, Rayleigh, SS6 7HX

- 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 and Mrs Grylls against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00341/FUL, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new dormer to the front elevation, internal alterations to the ground and first floor and the extension of the rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed extension of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, with a box dormer window and a single storey extension to the rear. The appeal property is located on a quiet residential street with the surrounding dwellings having a varied appearance, many with front and rear dormers. The proposal seeks to increase the depth of the rear box dormer over an existing single storey rear extension along with a smaller dormer and roof lights on the front elevation.
5. The existing dormer window spans nearly the full width of the roof. The proposal would partially extend the depth of the dormer above the existing rear extension. This would create an L-shaped dormer window with a significant expanse of flat roof. This would give the dwelling a two-storey appearance with a significantly higher eaves height than the existing.
6. Moreover, the proposed extension would create an overall dormer window which would be viewed as substantial in comparison to the size of the modest

host dwelling and would not appear subservient to it. As a result, the development would appear at odds with the original host dwelling.

7. Furthermore, the topography of Hillview Road rises in a westerly direction and, due to the semi-detached nature of the dwelling and the orientation of the site, the side of the proposed rear extension would be highly visible within the streetscene. As a result, it would appear unduly incongruous and out of keeping with the area.
8. The Council have raised no concerns regarding the other aspects of the proposal and I have no reason to come to a view contrary to this. I have considered whether I could issue a split decision and grant permission for works to the front of the dwelling. However, without the extension of the rear dormer, the internal changes could not take place in accordance with the proposed plans. Therefore the parts of the application are not clearly severable and it is not possible to issue a split decision.
9. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would be contrary to Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (December 2011) and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Development Management Plan (December 2014) which collectively seek to promote high quality design and the character of the locality, along with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. It is noted that the proposed development is required to meet the needs of the appellants family. However it is not considered that this benefit would be significant enough to outweigh the harm identified to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

J Whitfield

INSPECTOR