



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/24/3355893

6 Kendal Close, Hullbridge, Essex SS5 6DW

- 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 Ms Donna Thresher against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00549/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and extension of front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated on 12 December 2024. However, the sections pertinent to this appeal have not changed to such an extent as to affect the matters raised by the main parties. It has not therefore been necessary to seek their views and the revised version has been referenced in this decision.

Main Issue

- The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached, chalet, bungalow with front and rear dormer extensions. The dwelling, and the attached pair 8 Kendal Close present a strongly symmetrical appearance, with the exception of the existing single storey side extension at the appeal property which is set back from the front building line of the dwelling.
4. Properties within the street are generally semi-detached bungalows often featuring front dormers. Dwellings are visible as being set back from the road and characterised by a variety of separation gaps between buildings, giving the area a fairly spacious, unified and identifiable character clearly apparent in the street scene. There is little terracing and coalescence of buildings within the street scene, as generally there is at least side access if not space to the plot boundaries at first floor level.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would have a width of approximately 2.1m, be built in line with the front building line of the main dwelling and extend the

ridgeline of the existing roof. It would extend the host dwelling towards the neighbouring, semi-detached property, 4 Kendal Close, and would not have a 1m set back from the shared boundary at either ground or first floor level.

6. The proposed two-storey side extension and extended front dormer would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which it forms part. It would also reduce the existing gap between the appeal site dwelling and the neighbouring No. 4 at first floor level, creating a 'coalescence effect' when viewed from the street reducing the existing sense of spaciousness between buildings. The space retained between the two buildings would not be sufficient to avoid this impact.
7. I therefore find the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Local Development Framework Development Management Plan (2014). This requires, amongst other matters, that development promotes the character of the locality and contributes positively to the built environment.
8. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to the advice contained within adopted Supplementary Planning Document 2 – Housing Design (2007), which seeks side extensions to be located a minimum of 1 metre from the plot boundaries at first floor level to prevent the coalescence of adjacent properties. The proposal would also conflict with the Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments are visually attractive and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other matters

9. The Council concluded the proposal would not result in harmful living conditions to neighbouring occupiers, and based upon the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree. However, compliance with such policies would be a neutral matter in the balance and does not weigh in favour of the appeal scheme.
10. While there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers to the proposal, this is not a reason in itself to allow development which is visually harmful.
11. I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to the example of a similar extension put to me being accepted. On the evidence presented I therefore cannot be certain that it represents a direct parallel to the development. I have, in any event, determined the appeal based on its own planning merits.
12. The appellant makes reference to the proposed development being permitted under the provisions of Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015. Whilst this may be a fallback position for the appellant, only limited evidence to support this has been provided. The appeal before me concerns the refusal of an application for planning permission and I have determined this appeal on its individual merits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to indicate that the proposed development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

SJ DESAI

INSPECTOR