

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01.02.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/23/3327836

9 Sandown Road, Shotgate, Wickford, Essex SS11 8PA

- 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 Jonas Brunza against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00499/FULL, dated 11 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is part single/two storey rear and two storey side extension with front addition (revised scheme).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor front extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow close to the junction of Sandown Road with Bridge Road. The surrounding area is residential in character with a mix of chalet bungalows and two storey dwellings.
 4. Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) states that permission for the alteration and extension of existing dwellings will be refused if the development causes material harm to the character of the surrounding area, including the street scene.
 5. Except for the first floor front extension, the Council indicates that the proposal would not be harmful. I see no reason to disagree about the other elements of the overall proposal. No 9 currently has a prominent front roof slope with a central modest flat-roofed dormer. The same form of dormer is present on the adjoining property, reflecting a uniformity of character and appearance between the paired dwellings.
 6. The proposed front extension involves placing an additional larger dormer directly next to the existing one, above the garage. This would have a larger window than the existing dormer and a hipped roof. Consequently, it would
-

pay little regard to the existing design of the host dwelling or the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Due to its size within the roof slope, larger window and different roof form, the proposed dormer would fail to integrate effectively with the host dwelling, particularly the smaller, flat-roofed dormer directly next to it. It would also unbalance the current uniform appearance of the paired dwellings. The additional dormer would be prominent from surrounding views and, therefore, its incongruous and uncharacteristic appearance would harm the street scene.

7. There are examples of large dormers on properties across the junction on Bridge Road, but these are present in matching pairs. There are no apparent examples of dormers next to each other on the same property of a materially different design, size and appearance as is the case with the appeal proposal. The limited examples of mismatched dormers on paired dwellings do not provide a positive precedent for the appeal proposal. The appellant makes a comparison with No 11 Sandown Road, but this is a two storey dwelling without a front dormer. For these reasons, I give little weight to comparisons with development in the surrounding area.
8. I accept that the proposal would result in the creation of more living space and that it would make the appeal property more environmentally sustainable, using appropriate materials. While I have had full regard to these benefits, they do not outweigh the harm resulting from the built form of the extended dwelling proposed in this location. The fact that there were no objections to the proposal from neighbouring occupiers or other interested parties is not sufficient reason to set aside the above findings.
9. Accordingly, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed first floor front extension would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR