
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/20/3264014

47 Elizabeth Drive, Wickford, SS12 0DW

- 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 Jorge Wilson against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01130/FULL, dated 8 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Loft conversion – hip to gable – rear and front box dormers – front aspect roof light. Single storey rear extension. Internal modifications.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 49 Elizabeth Drive, with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached bungalow which has a hipped roof and a gable front projection. It also has a hipped roof projection to the rear. The adjoining bungalow is of a similar, handed appearance.
4. The proposal is for a loft conversion, involving a hip to gable roof extension and box dormers on the front and rear elevation. A single storey rear extension is also proposed.
5. The surrounding area comprises mainly of semi-detached or detached bungalows and chalets. Many of the dwellings in Elizabeth Drive and adjacent roads have been extended and altered, including front and rear dormer additions of various sizes and styles which form part of the character of the area.

6. The proposal would incorporate a hip to gable end and would result in an unbalanced appearance with the adjoining hip roof dwelling. However, I note that several other dwellings in the immediate vicinity have roof conversions with side gables, some resulting in a similar unbalanced appearance with the remainder of the semi. The Council also acknowledge in their officer report that such alterations can be carried out under permitted development rights and raise no objection to this aspect of the proposal. I also find the proposal to be acceptable in this regard.
7. The proposed front box dormer would be relatively small in scale and would be set in from both side margins of the roof and up from the eaves. Accordingly, it would sit within the roof slope and would not be overly dominant or prominent in relation to the host dwelling. Furthermore, I acknowledge that many similar front dormers are displayed along Elizabeth Drive.
8. The Council acknowledge within their officer report that other similar dormer roof extensions exist in the area. They state that most of these are historical and that the preference would be for a single bonnet style dormer on the front elevation. This does not however, appear to be based on any specific policy or design guidance although Policy BAS BE12 and the National Planning Policy Framework both require a high standard of design.
9. Overall, I find that the front dormer would be of an appropriate design and appearance and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would comply with Policy BAS BE12 and the Framework which collectively require a high standard of design.
10. The proposed rear flat roof box dormer would extend across the full width of the dwelling, with no meaningful set back from the side margins of the roof. Furthermore, it would extend down to the eaves and thus would completely dominate the rear roofscape. This leads me to conclude that the proposed rear dormer would be an over dominant and incongruous feature which would have a harmful effect of the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
11. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the hip to gable extension and the front dormer would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. However, the proposed rear dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and as such would be contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the LP and the Framework, which together require a high standard of design and that development does not harm the character of the surrounding area.

Living conditions

12. A single storey flat roof extension is also proposed to the rear of the dwelling in place of an existing shallow conservatory. The extension would be level with the existing rear projection and would extend across the dwelling to the shared side boundary with 49 Elizabeth Drive.
13. The closest part of 49 Elizabeth Drive to the boundary with the appeal site has not been extended. The proposed extension would have a considerable depth and would be visible above close boarded fence that runs along the side boundary. Whilst the extension would have a flat roof, due to its overall depth and proximity to the boundary, it would nonetheless lead to an unacceptable

sense of enclosure and would adversely effect on the outlook of occupiers of No 49, particularly when using the rear garden area closest to the dwelling.

14. In conclusion on this issue, the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 49 Elizabeth Drive, with particular reference to outlook. The proposal would be contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the LP and paragraph 127(f) of the Framework which require a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other matters

15. I acknowledge the benefits of the proposal in providing employment opportunities in the short term. I also recognise the benefits of the proposal to the appellant and his partner in providing additional living accommodation. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

16. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR