



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/D1590/D/24/3338593

198 Bishopsteignton, Shoeburyness, Southend-on-Sea, SS3 8BQ

- 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 Darren Bailey against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01566/FULH, dated 3 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extensions, install front and rear dormers with Juliette balcony to rear to form habitable accommodation in the loftspace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The application form described the proposed development as "Hip to gable roof extensions with front and rear dormers proposal". 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. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house, the row of 5 very similar dwellings, and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached two-storey, hipped roofed dwelling on the eastern side of Bishopsteignton, on a relatively wide plot, within a residential area. This house is 1 of a row of 5 very similar dwellings which are of a uniform appearance being similar in scale, form and style with distinctive hipped main roofs. This gives the row of 5 dwellings a distinctive character and consistency.
5. The description of the proposal is given in the headings above, but the controversial parts are the hip to Gable roof change and the dormer windows in front and rear roof slopes. Dormer windows in principle are not necessarily objectionable, and can be seen on the hipped roof of a house just across the road. In the case of the proposed dormers in the front roof slope, they would be set well in from the verges and a suitable distance from the ridge and

eaves. It is the conversion to a gabled roof that produces the discord that needs to be evaluated.

6. It is clear that the row of similar houses results from a carefully considered scheme. Their substantial presence and quality make it important to ensure that changes to 1 dwelling do not impinge on the group as a whole. The group does not consist of 5 replicas, but there are a number of features that bring a cohesion. This includes the fenestration on the front facades, the forward projection for the garage and arched entry to the front door, and of course the hipped roofs, which are also evident on the houses opposite. The differences in the design of the 5 houses include small feature gables above the central first floor window in 3 of the houses (a considered choice), changes in colour of the brickwork and garage doors, and in one case, a single garage door in place of a double door. These differences provide interest, but do not detract from the group as a considered whole.
7. The proposed gable roof would be very much out of character with the remaining houses, and would change the proportions between the elevations of the ground and first floors and the roof. In comparison, the roof would be a much more dominant feature, which the inclusion of the dormers would exacerbate.
8. Turning to the dormer on the rear elevation, this is more problematic in the sense that it would tend to dominate the new roof. It would be possible to glimpse this dormer from public views in surrounding streets, but since this is relatively minor, I do not think that a refusal based on this factor is justified.

Conclusions

9. I have considered all matters raised, including a potential permitted development fall-back position that arises from a Certificate of Lawfulness in 2012 (ref. 12/00913/CLP) for hip to gable roof extensions and a rear dormer. I am told that planning permission for a larger roof extension than that the subject of the Certificate was applied for in 2012 and was refused. It appears to me that it is unlikely that the roof extensions now proposed would fall under permitted development due the front dormers and the overall additional volume of the combined roof extensions. For these reasons I do not consider that there is a fall-back position that favours the appeal scheme before me.
10. For the reasons that I have set out in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, the appeal proposal would result in a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the house, the row of 5 very similar dwellings, and the streetscene. Therefore, I will dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR