



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2022

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/22/3302317

37 Broadlands Avenue, Hockley, Essex, SS5 5EN

- 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 J Clark against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00279/FUL, dated 4 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a loft conversion with a hip to gable extension with front and rear dormers and Juliett balcony to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the description that was given by the Council on the decision notice and which was repeated by the appellant on the appeal form as this more accurately describes the full extent of the proposed works compared with that which was given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of 37 Broadlands Avenue and the wider street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with a hipped roof and hip-ended forward projection to its outside edge. This is mirrored by the attached property at No 35. It sits within a reasonably long run of similar style and aged properties to this side of Broadlands Avenue. The proposal would include hip-to-gable changes to the main roof and forward projection, and 'box-like' dormers to the front and rear, each with three apparently inset gabled design features.
5. Part 8 of the Council's *Supplementary Planning Document 2 Housing Design - January 2007* (SPD) deals with rooms in the roof and dormer windows. For proposals involving rooms in the roof, the SPD states that any projecting walls or windows should respect the scale, form and character of the dwelling and should ensure that substantial roof verges are maintained at the sides and below any projecting dormer. It requires front and side dormers to have

- pitched roofs and it explicitly states that dormers projecting beyond a roof/hip will be refused.
6. Despite the decorative gabled features, the proposed dormer to the front would have a flat rather than pitched roof. It would be a large addition that would be heavily dependent upon the hip-to-gable change to accommodate its size. It would significantly alter the existing roof profile and would dominate the front roof slope of the dwelling in a manner that would show little respect for the original architectural composition of the building overall. To my mind it would precisely represent the size and type of front dormer the SPD advises against.
 7. During my visit I saw a number of properties along Broadlands Avenue similar to No 37 and which have been modified at roof level, including some hip-to-gable changes and front facing dormer windows. I have not been presented with any of the planning history to these, however the majority of the dormers had pitched roofs and were modest in size. The examples with large, 'box-like' dormers, including those within the wider area that have been drawn to my attention by the appellant, demonstrate to me the harm that can be caused by such insensitive additions. Other examples that have been photographed by the appellant relate to dwellings noticeably different in character and form to the appeal property. Regardless, I saw none that compared with, or justified, the excessive scale of the appeal proposal.
 8. Overall, I find that due to its size, siting and design, the front dormer window would be out of keeping with the modest scale and form of the original bungalow. As such, the proposal would appear intrusive and harmful to the established character of the street scene. Its failure to follow advice within the SPD and to display a quality of design that would respect and positively contribute to the local context means that there would be conflict with Policy CP1 of the Rochford District Council Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Plan 2014. For the same reasons there would be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR