



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2024

by Sian Griffiths BSc(Hons) DipTP MScRealEst MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22.03.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/23/3335119

11 Templewood Road, Benfleet SS7 2RJ

- 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 Jeremy Thompson against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01012/FULH, dated 11 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is first floor side extension and hip to gable loft conversion with rear and front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was changed during the determination of the application to reflect what would require planning permission. As a result, I have used the description of development in the decision notice for accuracy.

Reasons

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
4. Templewood Road is a pleasant, tree-lined residential street with a suburban character. Most of the houses along the street are of a traditional design, but there is some architectural variety with a mix of bungalows, chalet bungalows and two storey houses, some of which have had loft conversions.
5. Saved Policy EC2 (Design) of the Castle Point Borough Local Plan (1998) (LP), encourages good design which reflects local character. This is supported by the Residential Design Guidance (2012) (SPD) which provides guidance (RDG7 – Roof Development) on extensions, including roof development and the use of dormer windows. The guide supports the development of dormers where they are well proportioned and integrated into the remainder of the host dwelling.
6. The appeal site at No 11 forms part of a pair of almost identical semi-detached dwellings. The adjoining neighbour (No 9) has a gable roof finish and roof light window which has facilitated a loft conversion. This does mean the pair are not completely symmetrical. As part of the appeal proposals proposed change in roof design from a hip to a gable would act to re-balance the pair and the

council agree with this point. The council, in the officer report, have also made it clear that they do not object to the proposed rear box dormer.

7. I can see that the appellant has tried to keep the proposed dormer windows of a similar scale to the existing fenestration in the principal elevation. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a planning permission for the opposite neighbour (which forms part of a similar pair of semi-detached houses) at No 10. They have included some drawings showing that these appeal proposals would be similar to that approved design (LPA Ref 21/0849/FUL). That scheme does not appear to have been implemented.
8. Whilst that scheme is similar to what is proposed here, I do not agree it provides a precedent that would make this scheme acceptable. I am unaware of the full circumstances of that case and have determined this appeal on its own merits. In my view, these appeal proposals would result in a significant imbalance between No 10 and No 9.
9. This resulting imbalance would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling as well as the wider street scene.
10. I therefore find the appeal proposals to be contrary to saved Policy EC2 of the LP and RDG7 of the SPD for these reasons.

Conclusions

11. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Sian Griffiths

INSPECTOR