



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/24/3348280

5 Mapleleaf Close, Hockley, Essex SS5 5DZ

- 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 McCluskey against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00911/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 1.5 storey extension & extension of roof hip to gable end together with alterations/additions to front and rear dormers and rooms in roof and alterations to openings on all elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 1.5 storey extension and extension of roof hip to gable end together with alterations/additions to front and rear dormers and rooms in roof and alterations to openings on all elevations at 5 Mapleleaf Close, Hockley, Essex SS5 5DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00911/FUL, subject to the following conditions: -
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: R01 and R03A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of proposed development from the planning application form although I note it is expressed differently on other documents.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. I have had regard to the revised Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2 'Housing Design' states that for proposals involving rooms in the roof of dwellings, any projecting walls or windows shall respect the scale, form, and character of the existing or proposed dwelling and shall ensure that substantial roof verges are maintained at the sides and below any projecting dormer. The guidance goes on to state that front and side dormers shall have pitched roofs and that dormers projecting above the ridge line or beyond a roof/hip will be refused. However, this guidance does not sit in isolation to the development plan that requires consideration to be given to the scale and form of new development and its appropriateness to the character of the locality.
6. The property currently hosts flat roof extensions to both the front and rear of the dwelling. Both these additions, although set up from the eaves, are level with the existing roofline of the dwelling. The existing roof extensions do not fully conform with the SPD.
7. There are other examples of roof dormers in the area of varying designs, including front flat roof box dormers, one of which runs the full width of the property. Some of the properties have been altered from hip to gable. The adjoining property hosts flat roof extensions within both the front and rear roof slopes. Overall, there is a mix to the roof forms and roof additions within this localised area. The majority of those roof extensions are level with the existing roof line of the host dwelling or are close to it.
8. The proposal would extend the property to its side and create a longer extension of the roof dormers at both the front and rear of the property up to the height of the ridge. The rear roof extension would not be prominent in public views. The proposal would create a large addition to the roof at the front of the property. I acknowledge the proposal by design would not represent the size and type of front dormer advocated by the SPD. However, given the current character of the area with its varying forms of roof extensions and side gables, the front roof extension would not appear conspicuously out of keeping within the context of the existing street scene. As such, I do not find that the proposal would represent dominant features within the roof slopes such that would be visually harmful additions to the dwelling.
9. I have been referred to Inspectors' decisions elsewhere that related to similar development to that proposed here. I have not been provided with the full details of those cases that would enable me to consider what similarity, if any, those proposals and locations would have to that of the proposal and site before me. This development is at a different location to those examples cited. Therefore, the proposal before me can and should be considered on its own merits.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policy DM1 part (xi) of the Rochford District Council Development Management Plan 2014, the Council's SPD 2 'Housing Design' and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be of a high standard of design requiring that developments promote the character of the locality to ensure

that development positively contributes to the surrounding built environment and be of a scale and form appropriate to the locality.

Conditions

11. I have considered the planning conditions put forward by the Council in light of paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition and in the interests of certainty it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the visual interests of the locality matching materials of the extension is necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and subject to the conditions listed, this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR