



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2023

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/22/3312701

11 Hillside Avenue, Hawkwell, SS5 4NN

- 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 Woodrow Barker against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00997/FUL, dated 12 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable loft conversion with front dormer, a rooflight to the rear & a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the front dormer on the appearance of the property and the character of the street.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow with an existing hipped roof, although I understand that there has been a Lawful Development Certificate issued in October 2022 for a hip to gable loft conversion with rear box dormer & rooflights to the front. The immediate street scene comprises a mix of dwelling types and forms, with detached and semi-detached bungalows and two storey houses.
4. Beginning with the development plan policies, Policy CP1 of the Rochford District Council Core Strategy (2011) promotes high quality design, which has regard to the character of the local area. Design is expected to enhance the local identity of an area. This point is expanded in Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan (2014) which states that "*The design of new developments should promote the character of the locality to ensure that the development positively contributes to the surrounding natural and built environment and residential amenity, without discouraging originality, innovation or initiative*". Part (ix) of Policies DM1 requires that regard must also be had to the detailed advice and guidance in Supplementary Planning Document 2 'Housing Design', as well as to the Essex Design Guide.
5. These policies and guidance conform with the latest version of government policies in the National Planning Policies Framework (the Framework) that place

importance on the need for high quality design in new development, and that poor design should be refused. Paragraph 134 b) of the Framework states:

"Development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. Conversely, significant weight should be given to:

a) development which reflects local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes; and/or

b) outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings."

It is against this policy background that the appeal proposal should be judged.

6. The proposal includes a hip to gable roof extension with a large composite dormer to the front. This dormer consists of 2 dual pitched roof dormers linked by a vertical façade, set just behind the faces of the pitched roof elements, having a sloping roof linking the inner faces of the dual pitched elements. The mono-pitched element of the dormer roofs would extend to just below the ridge of the main roof, which is enlarged because of the gable conversion. The totality of this combination dormer would have a horizontal width of some 7.2m, occupying the majority of the roof of this part of the semi-detached pair of bungalows.
7. The materials of the dormer are shown in the Design and Access Statement and application form to be roof tiles to match the main roof with the vertical elements clad in a folded seam zinc cladding system to match the darker colours of the roof tiles. The dual-pitched roof elements would have rather small double casements set into a quite broad façade that, as already described, would be finished in dark zinc cladding. The composite whole would have a poor relationship with the existing fenestration of the bungalow, and the vertical elements would not relate to existing materials. The effect of the whole would be an addition to the enlarged roof that would be inappropriate in scale, over dominant and would not be subordinate to the existing, or as proposed to be altered, dwelling.
8. There are precedents put forward by the appellant, that have been granted planning permission, that are said to indicate that the appeal proposal follows development in the locality that has been found to be acceptable. However, these do not suggest to me that the appeal proposal before me is satisfactory. There are also other dormers in the immediate vicinity that would not meet present expectations in terms of design: these do not justify adding further examples of poor appearance.
9. For the reasons that I have set out in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, I conclude that the proposed composite dormer windows do not reach the standard of design that the development plan policies and those of the Framework require, and that the proposed front dormer would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the property and the character of the street.

10. Therefore, I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR