



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2024

by Philip Willmer BSc Dip Arch RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/24/3345885

11 Hillside Avenue, Hawkwell, Essex, SS5 4NN.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Woodrow Barker against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00058/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a flat roof infill between front pitched dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a flat roof infill between front pitched dormers at 11 Hillside Avenue, Hawkwell, Essex, SS5 4NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00058/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing: 24/502 1988 Rev B.

Procedural Matters

2. It is clear from the evidence provided and my site visit that the development has been undertaken onsite. I shall consider and determine the appeal accordingly.
3. I note that a previous proposal for a sloping roof link between the two front dormers was refused by the Council and dismissed at appeal. However, I shall consider this appeal on my observations on site and the individual design merits of the scheme design before me.

Main Issue

4. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the architectural integrity of the host property and the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property 11 Hillside Avenue (No 11) was originally a modest semi-detached hipped roof bungalow. However, it has now been altered and extended to form a chalet bungalow. The roof has been re-clad in contrasting dark concrete tiles and is now gabled ended with dormers front and back.

Accordingly, the chalet is of a striking contrasting contemporary design to the other half of this semi-detached pair. Visually, it bears only limited reference to the original design of the pair of bungalows.

6. As I observed the avenue is characterised by a range of bungalows, chalets and two-storey houses, designed and built in an eclectic mix of architectural styles and forms. In addition to the mock Tudor style houses with half timbering I saw that a number of properties have been altered adopting a similar palate of details, materials and colours to that used by the developers at No 11.
7. Two pitched roof dormers to the street elevation were approved as part of the scheme of alteration. However, to provide adequate headroom in the now converted roof space these two dormers have been linked by a simple flat roof infill section. This linking section is set well back from the face of the two dormers and the flat roof is set below their ridge lines. The linking section has also been formed in dark grey zinc to match that of the front and rear dormers and the same huge as the new dark concrete roof tiles. As I observed on site for all these reasons the two dormers remain as the dominant form and most prominent features of the front roof slope and the visual impact of the link is relatively deminimus.
8. The design of the front dormer, if considered as a whole, is not of a typical vernacular form or design. However, on balance, in this case, I am not persuaded, as asserted by the Council that the new link has caused harm to the architectural integrity of the host property as altered, resulted in a poor relationship to nearby buildings so as to be detrimental to the street scene or the character and appearance of the wider area. Indeed, in terms of the overall development it is a modest and not particularly prominent addition.
9. I conclude in respect of the main issue that, given the approved extensive alterations to the host property, the modest flat roof link as built has caused no harm to the architectural character and appearance of the host property or the character and appearance of the street scene and the wider area. The development therefore accords with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy CP1 of Rochford District Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted December 2011), Policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council's Development Management Plan (Adopted 16 December 2014), the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 2-*Housing Design* (Adopted January 2007) and the Essex Design Guide as they relate, amongst other things to the requirement for high quality design that has regard to the flavour of local development.

Conditions

10. The Council have, in addition to the standard time condition suggested a condition in respect of materials. However, as the development has been completed, I do not consider either of these conditions relevant in this case.
11. In the interests of certainty, I shall however impose a condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Philip Willmer

INSPECTOR