



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2023

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3327713

3 Lakeside, Billericay, CM12 0NF

- 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 and Mrs Cliff Solomons against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00390/FULL dated 17 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extension, rooflights to front, front and rear dormers and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as single storey rear extension and loft conversion, with dormer window to front and rear, including build-up of gable wall. The council changed this to the description used in the heading above, as did the appeal form. I have adopted it as it more clearly identifies the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. As set out on the council's decision notice, it is the proposed hip to gable and front dormer that is found unacceptable, meaning that the rooflights to front, rear dormer and single storey rear extension are not in contention. Thus the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed hip to gable and front dormer on the appearance of the appeal property and its attached neighbour and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The character of Lakeside arises from a mixture of semi-detached and detached bungalows and chalets. A large number of the dwellings have bonnet and front box dormer extensions of varying designs and proportions, probably a number being of some age and likely to result from previous permitted development rights. The appeal site is part of a semi-detached pair of bungalows, the pair sharing the same footprint and roof form as mirror images. This basic hipped-roof design, with forward projecting wings, also under hipped roofs, and with central doorways, is repeated in the following 2 pairs.

5. As a result of this repetition, the symmetry and balance of the pairs, notwithstanding the mix of brickwork and render to the walls, provides a pleasing and distinctive design. It is apparent that the change from a hip to a gable on one of the bungalows would stand out as visually harmful to the streetscene. The symmetry and balance of the pair would largely be lost. Whilst there are examples within the road of additions that have not been beneficial to the character and appearance of the area, this does not justify further harm.
6. For the appellants it is claimed that the Hip to Gable extension and the rear dormer could be constructed as permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended. However, it appears that there has not been a Lawful Development Certificate applied for, and nor have I been provided with calculations that demonstrate this. Obviously, if it is the case that it can be carried out as permitted development, that is a course that is open to the appellants, but of itself it is not persuasive. The possibility that this option may be available does not justify the grant of express planning permission in the face of the harm that I have identified above.
7. As to the front dormer, in the light of the number of dormer windows in Lakeside, as a common feature of the area, I do not find it so disruptive of the symmetry and balance of the pair of bungalows that it would, of its self, justify the refusal of permission.
8. However, for the reasons that I have given, the proposed hip to gable alteration would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the appeal property and its attached neighbour and the streetscene. Therefore, I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR