



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/24/3357055

4 Rocheway, Rochford, SS4 1DQ

- 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 Amy Watt and Alex Holden against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00479/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing store and rear projections and construct part single storey, part two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing store and rear projections and construct part single storey, part two storey rear and side extension at 4 Rocheway, Rochford, SS4 1DQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00479/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building, save as required by condition 3.
 - 3) No start shall be made on the development hereby permitted other than demolition and site clearance until details of the external finish on the elevations of the flat roofed first-floor rear extension have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall be carried out in full compliance with those approved detail
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, save for the matters dealt with in condition 3.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the first-floor rear extension on the existing dwelling and the character of the area.

Reasons

3. The site is a semi-detached house located on the southern side of Rocheway, close to the junction with Stambridge Road. The area is predominantly residential with a mix of bungalows and two storey houses. In this locality, a wide palette of materials has been used including differing facing brick, render and cladding. The

general roofscape is varied, comprises gables and hips. Generally, plots tend to be modest with adequate setbacks from the public highway. The appeal property has a tiled pitched roof and red brick front elevation with the side gable elevation rendered. It also has a flat roofed side extension.

4. The element of the appeal proposal that is in question is the proposed flat roof to the first-floor rear extension and the materials that are proposed for its elevational treatment. Local plan policy and that of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) require that development is of a high-quality design and relates well to the character of the area.
5. The appeal property and its neighbour have rear outriggers. The appeal development would extend the outrigger by a wraparound extension at ground and first floor level. The two-story extension at the side of the house would have a pitched roof, which would be seen from Rocheway. However, the rear pitch would carry across from the main roof, leaving the part of the extension across to the outrigger in a flat roof form. The elevations of this flat roof element are proposed to be in vertical cladding, in a colour to be selected.
6. The flank elevation of No.4 Rocheway and that of the unattached neighbour at No.2, are separated by a gap of 2.37m. This gap is presently closed at ground floor level by a garage-like store room. This form of accommodation would be repeated in the appeal proposal. The first-floor element of the wraparound side and rear elevation under the pitched roof would leave a gap of about 0.9m.
7. Considering the effect of the first-floor rear extension on the character of the area, from the public domain, bearing in mind the narrow gap at first-floor level, very little would be seen of the flat roof that is subject of the refusal. The extent to which it might be observed and have harm to the character of the area, which is very limited, does not justify refusal of permission.
8. The character of the area, can reasonably be extended to the effect that is experienced by those with a view from private garden areas. Again, this would be a very limited area. I saw that the neighbouring property at No.8 Rocheway has an almost identical flat roof to a first-floor extension. This does not mean that it is automatically acceptable, but it is not a feature that stands out as being greatly incongruous. It is not an ideal solution to a situation where combining a pitched roof with existing roof forms is difficult, but it is practical and cannot be seen as entirely inappropriate. For these reasons, the flat roof form would not have a damaging impact on the character of the existing dwelling.
9. This leaves the question of the proposed cladding to this part of the appeal development. I agree that this form of finish would be discordant, and unnecessarily so. However, the appellant has stated a willingness to reconsider this finish, and this could be dealt with by a condition.
10. For the above reasons the appeal will be allowed.

Conditions

11. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested 2 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance. The council's suggested conditions are that the materials to be used in

the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall match those used in the existing building, and that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree that these are necessary to ensure that the development is completed with a satisfactory appearance, and for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted. However, these conditions will require amendment to deal with the point about the proposed cladding that I referred to in paragraph 9 above. I will also impose the condition referred to in that paragraph for the reasons there explained.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR