



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2020

by Julie Dale Clark BA (Hons) DipTP MCD DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09/12/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/20/3250593

66 Abbey Road, Hullbridge SS5 6DJ

- 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 Ashley Knott against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01132/FUL, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is proposed front dormer and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the dormer extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is one of a pair of semi-detached bungalows and the proposal would add a flat roofed dormer extension to the front of the bungalow; there is an existing rear dormer extension. The bungalow is one of a small row of similar bungalows; all without front dormer extensions. However, two doors away, a similar bungalow does have a front dormer extension similar to that proposed here. Next to that is a detached house with double dormer windows to the front. Generally, the area is a mix of bungalows and two-storey houses.
4. Development Management Plan Policy DM1¹ indicates that the design of new developments should promote the character of the locality to ensure that the development positively contributes to the surrounding, in this case, built environment. Advice on extensions to existing houses is included in the Council's Housing Design SPD² which, amongst other things, requires extensions to harmonise in character, scale and form with the existing dwelling and have regard to the visual impact of the extension on the appearance of the street scene. Further advice relates specifically to dormer windows acknowledging that many dwellings were not designed for this type of extension.

¹ Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Development Management Plan, Adopted 16 December 2014.

² Rochford District Council Supplementary Planning Document 2 Housing Design, Adopted January 2007.

5. I appreciate that there are other similar dormer extensions in the area but their presence does not convince me that allowing this one would be acceptable. The proposed dormer would appear as a large box like structure on the front of the house. It would dominate the simple appearance of the bungalow and conflict with the appearance of this row of bungalows in the street scene.
6. I have considered all matters raised but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed dormer extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy DM1 and SPD2 and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR