



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2021

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/21/3269893

74 Wyburns Avenue, Rayleigh SS6 7QU

- 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 L Wilson against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00970/FUL, dated 15 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension + loft conversion with front and rear dormers.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The proposal includes a side extension and a rear dormer as well as a front dormer. The reason for refusal relates to the front dormer only and the Council has indicated that it has previously accepted the other elements of this application. Whilst the proposal includes the various elements, each of which is not necessarily independent, which make up the totality of the proposed enlargement of this property, I shall limit my assessment to the effects of the front dormer only.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located at the end of a cul-de-sac. The proposal would involve the addition of a first floor to what is a fairly traditionally designed true bungalow. Although there are different house styles in the area, including front dormers, the dwellings on the southern side of Wyburns Avenue are characterised by bungalows of a similar design to No 74 and with a notable absence of front dormers. They also have a relatively shallow roof which would make a dormer appear more prominent in the roof plane than the taller roofed properties in the area.

5. Development Management Plan DM1¹ indicates that developments are designed so that they promote the character of the locality and ensure that the development positively contributes to the surrounding natural and built environment. DM1 also refers to the Councils Housing Design SPD² and the Essex Design Guide³ which provide further advice in relation to design, including dormers.
6. The proposed dormer would be close to the ridge of the bungalow and appear as a dominant feature on the front elevation. It would be out of keeping with the original design of the bungalow, appear dominant and therefore have a harmful impact on the area generally. This would be particularly detrimental due to the lack of front dormers to the bungalows of a similar design to the appeal site in Wyburns Avenue. The proposal would be inconsistent with Policy DM1 and the accompanying design advice referred to.
7. The appellant has referred to a number of other properties in the area, some close by, where dormers have been approved by the Council. I do not dispute that there is evidence of other dormers as I have referred to above but my concern lies with this property in this road. I also note that No 74 is located at the end of the cul-de-sac and is set back from the road. I accept that this property is not as prominent as others in the road but this does not justify a proposal that is otherwise unacceptable on this property.
8. I have taken all matters raised into consideration but none alter my conclusion. I conclude that the proposed front dormer would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy DM1 and the design guidance and therefore the appeal fails.

J D Clark

INSPECTOR

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

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

³ The Essex Design Guide 2018 Edition V.3