



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2021

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/21/3279557

92 Common Lane, Thundersley, Benfleet SS7 3SL

- 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 Frazer Downing against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0473/FUL, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with front and rear dormer extensions
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of bungalows and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one half of a symmetrically arranged pair of bungalows with a pitched roof. It is situated in a residential area and forms part of a group of semi-detached bungalows in this portion of Common Lane that, with only a few exceptions, retain their original roof forms at the front. I note that in nearby streets there are semi-detached bungalows with prominent dormers in their front roof slopes. Whilst front dormers have become part of the established character of neighbouring streets, they do not however form part of the visual context of the appeal property.
4. The proposal would comprise the formation of an almost full-width dormer within the rear roof slope and a slightly narrower one within the front slope. These additions would severely disrupt the symmetrical arrangement of the pair of bungalows. The front dormer would be at odds with the front roof slopes on neighbouring properties and would be an incongruous and overly dominant element in the street scene.
5. Due to its siting and size, the front dormer would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair of bungalows and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (1998) which seeks a high standard of design and stipulates that the scale and siting of development should be appropriate to its setting and not harm the character of its surroundings.

There is also conflict with Policy RDG7 of the Council's Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2013), which states that proposals for any form of roof development which results in the detrimental disruption or loss of symmetry to a pair or group of dwellings will be refused.

Conclusion

6. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR