



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07.06.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/23/3335008

39A Helena Road, Rayleigh, SS6 8LN

- 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 Man against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00820/FUL, dated 27 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is a porch extension (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed porch extension on the character and appearance of the dwelling, and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached bungalow, with a hipped main roof, located in a well-established residential area with a wide variety of housing forms, and no predominant style. Many properties in the area have had extensions, loft conversions, and alterations. This bungalow, like its immediate neighbours to the south, has an open frontage given over to paving providing car parking spaces. This open aspect, coupled with the location at the junction of Helena Road with Alexandra Road, means that the bungalow is prominent in the local street scene.
4. The pre-existing bungalow, prior to the erection of the porch extension, had an 'L' shaped footprint, with a forward projecting gabled element towards the road. It appears that there was a segmented, flat roofed small porch within the angle between the main element of the dwelling and the gabled projection.
5. The front elevation of the porch continues the surface treatment of the front of the existing gabled element, under a flat roof with a plain narrow fascia board. The front of the new porch contains a door and 4-paned window, the latter following the style of the pre-existing window. The fascia board continues around the blank flank elevation that is constructed in brick, matching the existing flank wall, but set below the eaves level.
6. The result of the development is a poor arrangement of elements, including the flat roofed design, and its scale and bulk, that do not relate well to the original bungalow, and do not integrate with the original form of the building. This is

poor design which both local policy and guidance, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) seeks to avoid. The latest version of the Framework (December 2023) is especially clear that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve (paragraph 131). The appeal development is conspicuous in its prominent location, relating poorly to the host dwelling, and standing out as unsatisfactory in design terms within the streetscene. Thus it is contrary to the policies and guidance to which reference is made in the refusal notice.

7. I have considered all other matters raised, including consents at 35A Helena Road, at 124 and 126 Bull Lane, and at St Bridgets, Louise Road. None of these examples represent a similar situation to the appeal site and the development on it, and they are not persuasive when viewed against the matters that I have dealt with. Nor do I consider that the design of the extension aligns with that of the pre-existing design of the porch. For the reasons given in paragraph 6 above, I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR