
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2021

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/21/3278282
21 Kingley Drive, Wickford, SS12 0EP

- 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 Julie Holley against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 21/00470/FULL, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is to remove existing conservatory. Erect a single storey side and rear extension. Extend one side dormer and build a new one on the opposite flank.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published. However, as the policies of most relevance to this proposal have not changed fundamentally it has not been necessary to seek further comments from the parties.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. In Part E of the appeal form a different wording has been entered, but as the parties have not provided written confirmation that a revised description of development was agreed I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached chalet in a residential area, and its original design is repeated in the vicinity, with a steeply pitched roof and a modestly proportioned flat-roofed dormer on one side. This original dormer design is built through the eaves line and supported by the ground floor wall.
6. In the locality some of the original dormer windows have been extended, and additional dormers added, although these are the exception in the street scene. In this context, the proposed width of the extended dormer and the modest gaps to the front and rear would create an unacceptably bulky addition that

- would dominate the roof slope in which it would be set. Whilst there would be more generous space to the roof ridge, this would not compensate for the disproportionate width of the dormer.
7. The proposed blank dormer window on the western side of the dwelling would be a visually intrusive feature out of keeping with the design of the dwelling, with the absence of windows making it appear awkward and contrived. The size, scale and design of both dormer windows would be highly visible on the dwelling and in the street scene, and would not make a positive contribution.
 8. The depth and forward position of the proposed side extension would make it a far more notable feature than the existing garage and carport. However, flat-roofs are a design feature of this dwelling style, and are found elsewhere in the vicinity. Despite the relatively limited set back of the extension behind the front wall, its design would be in keeping with the dwelling, and the single-storey height would minimise its visual impact on the dwelling and the street scene.
 9. I am mindful of other extended dormer windows in the vicinity, including on the neighbouring properties. Some have no windows, although these are the exception and are not reflective of the prevailing dormer style. However, none appear to be directly comparable to the cumulative proposals in this case; limited information has been provided of the planning permissions for these developments and the planning policies against which they were assessed. Given the current emphasis on high quality design, historic developments in the locality do not justify acceptance of the appeal proposal.
 10. I appreciate the aims to revitalise the property and to enable a larger family living area. I also note the reasoning which has guided the proposed design, and the lack of any local objections. However, balancing these factors against the visual impact of the proposals on its setting, I conclude that the size, scale and design of the proposed dormer window and dormer extension would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider street scene. This would be contrary to the design aims of Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007, which seeks to resist proposals which cause material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene, or which cause over-dominance. This is consistent with up-to-date design aims of the Framework, which seeks the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places, which are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR