
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 March 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1ST April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/21/3286900

Teedupah, 1 Mornington Crescent, Canvey Island, SS8 8AS

- 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 Ms Emma Schofield against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0677/FUL, dated 23 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a "*Dormer front extension, rear dormer extension over existing ground floor extension, reduce size and adjust position of existing 1st floor side window*".
-

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 property and the wider area, and upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, chalet style property with a half-hipped side gable, a single dormer window to the front and two dormer windows to the rear. The proposal would include various elements. A second dormer would be added to the front elevation. An existing single-storey lean-to extension to part of the rear elevation would be replaced with a flat roof addition of the same size, with the smallest of the two rear dormers replaced with a larger dormer addition, and a side window at first-floor level on the existing gable repositioned.
4. The Council's *Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document January 2013* (SPD) includes advice on roof development and detailing. At RDG7 it advises that dormers should be ancillary features that must not dominate the roofscape and must be provided with substantial roof verges above, below and to the sides. At RDG8 the SPD advises that development

should be consistent with the architectural approach of the dwelling and must not result in prominent, dominant, alien, or incongruous features which detract from the visual appearance of the dwelling or public realm.

5. The Council has no objection to the proposed front dormer. I agree that it would be well-proportioned and comfortable in its setting, reflecting a similar arrangement to the attached property at No 2.
6. The roof addition to the rear would sit over part of the single-storey extension and would span a significant proportion of the building's width. It would have a flat roof and would extend up to, and flush with, the side gable. Although described as a dormer extension, it would appear effectively as a bulky, first-floor extension that would dominate the roofscape and show little respect for the architectural composition of the building. In my assessment it would be a development type the SPD explicitly advises against. Its incongruous form would be evident in oblique views from Mornington Crescent, where the half-hip roof detailing would be lost, as well as from the public domain along Kamerwyk Avenue to the rear. My impression overall is that, due to its scale, siting and design, the rear roof extension would fail to harmonise with the existing property to the detriment of its character and appearance and that of the wider area. As such it would conflict with Policies EC2 and H17 of the Local Plan 1998 which require a high standard of design for alterations and extensions to existing buildings, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Living Conditions

7. The property has an existing first-floor bedroom window to the side elevation. This is currently the only source of light and outlook to Bedroom 1. The window faces towards the rear elevation of 17 Mornington Road, which itself has two first-floor windows looking back towards the appeal property at fairly close quarters, neither of which appeared to be obscurely glazed.
8. Although the proposal would involve shifting the first-floor side window backwards along the flank wall of the building, its revised position would have little, if any, impact upon the existing relationship between these two neighbouring properties. The degree of mutual overlooking that already exists would be largely unchanged. Therefore, although there would be conflict with the 9m separation distance required between first-floor windows and a site's boundary by RDG5 of the SPD, I am unable to identify any harm to the existing living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. I therefore find no conflict with any of the development plan policies that have been brought to my attention as they relate to the standard of amenity for existing and future users, or with the Framework in this regard.

Conclusions

9. Notwithstanding my findings as they relate to the second main issue, for the reasons given I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan INSPECTOR