
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2021

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/20/3262815

96 Down Hall Road, Rayleigh, Essex SS6 9LT

- 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 Mrs Sandy Hayes against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00739/FUL was refused by notice dated 1 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension to create a new kitchen with utility, and new master bedroom upstairs. Single-storey side extension for a new snug area with a bathroom and additional bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies on a prominent corner position within a primarily residential area. Whilst the area is characterised by dwellings of various designs, a strong characteristic is for roofs of traditional design, including gables, pitches and dormers. Together, they contribute to the scale, form and design of development in the area that defines the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The appeal property is a detached chalet dwelling with front, rear and side single storey projections. Traditional gable ends front Down Hall Road and Gayleighs.
 5. The proposal includes a rear two-storey extension together with a single-storey side addition. The roof over the proposed two-storey rear extension would extend beyond the side wall of the original dwelling and over the proposed single storey side/rear extension. The proposed side and rear extensions would form a wraparound. From my observations, the disproportionate eaves of the proposed two-storey extension required to accommodate the roof of the single-storey extension would form an asymmetric design that would appear
-

incongruous with the traditional scale, form and design of the existing dwelling. In addition, the proposed roof design would feature an awkward roof join at the side, which would appear as a contrived awkward arrangement. This would further exacerbate the incongruous appearance of the proposal.

6. I note that planning permission has been granted for a two-storey rear extension. Nevertheless, from my observations, due to the scale, form and design of the proposal before me, I consider that it would appear as an unacceptably dominant addition to the dwelling.
7. For the same reasons as stated above and due to the prominent position in this corner location in an area of roof structures of traditional design, I consider that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.
8. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, including the personal circumstances of the appellant, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DM1 in the Rochford District Council's Development Management Plan (2014) where it seeks to ensure that new development positively contributes to the surrounding built environment. I consider this policy to be broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly where the Framework seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR