



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/24/3356447

19 Hengist Gardens, Wickford, ESSEX SS11 7EL

- 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 James Yates against the decision of Basildon Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00809/FULL.
 - The development proposed is for front and rear dormers, side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At my visit I saw that building works were taking place at the site. It is not clear whether those building works would fully accord with the details of the planning application that is now the subject of this planning appeal. For this reason, I have therefore considered the appeal as a standalone development.
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 dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

5. There is some variation to the roofs forms along Hengist Gardens. The appellant has drawn attention to some of these with photographs having been provided. I saw that those semi-detached bungalows within the street, have, in the main, retained their original and distinctive pitched roof form, although some host small roof dormers to the front. The appeal property forms part of a pair of semi-detached hipped roof properties that presently do not host any dormer roof enlargements. This original unaltered form to the bungalows contributes towards the character and appearance of the semi-detached bungalows in the area.
6. I note that planning permission has been granted in 2022 for the erection of a replacement semi-detached dwelling house at No. 17 Hengist Gardens, the adjoining dwelling, that has not yet been implemented. I have been provided the

planning application details for that development that illustrate the approved dwelling would incorporate a main hipped roof with a front and rear gabled projection. That design form takes a similar design approach to that of the existing dwelling itself and that of other hipped roof forms within this street scene.

7. The proposed part single and part two storey side and rear extension would be a large and wide addition to the existing dwelling. The proposed rear dormer would also add a large and dominant addition to the roof, even whilst retaining setbacks from the side boundaries of the roof and the eaves. Taking the extensions collectively, the enlargement of the dwelling would represent a disproportionate addition to the host property that, along with its gable roof design, would unbalance the property's symmetrical appearance in regards of its attached neighbour. This would result in visual harm to the host property, the pair of semi-detached (whether or not the planning permission relating to No.17 were implemented) and to the character and appearance of the wider street scene. The visual harm arising from the proposed development would be clearly visible in public views from Hengist Gardens, as well as from the alleyway that run alongside the dwelling.
8. A certificate of lawfulness application has been approved at the site for a hip to gable roof extension, rear dormer and front rooflights. The certificate of lawfulness development would unbalance the hipped roof scape to the pair of semi-detached properties and have a dominant appearance within the rear roof slope. Nonetheless, the proposal that is before me relates to a larger and much more substantial proposal to the existing dwelling house than could be created by way of the certificate of lawfulness processes. Therefore, this potential alternative development holds little weight in favour of the proposal. As such, the proposal can and should be considered on its own individual merits.
9. The proposal is not within the setting of any listed buildings and does not fall within a conservation area. I acknowledge that no expressions of public interest were received during the planning application proposal. Whilst these are merits of the proposed scheme, they do not significantly outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene that I have identified above. Furthermore, these benefits would not justify the proposed development.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. As such, the proposed development would conflict with Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007 and the provisions of the Framework. This policy and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be refused if harm to the character of the surrounding area and the street scene would result.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, this appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR