



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/D1590/D/24/3358125

22 Glenwood Avenue, Eastwood, SS9 5EB

- 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 Miss M O'Neill against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01311/FULH.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof extension with dormers to front and rear to form habitable accommodation in the loft space, erect single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed front and rear dormers on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the rear garden scene, the streetscene and the wider surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, on the northwest side of Glenwood Avenue, is set within a residential area and contains a semi-detached bungalow. This part of Glenwood Avenue is made up of a mix of dwellings, including bungalows with roof accommodation.
4. The proposal is for a hip to gable roof extension some 2.9m high, 3.9m wide and 7.3m deep. There would be two roof lights to the front roofslope of the bungalow, and a flat roof dormer, some 3.3m wide, 1.6m high and 2.4m deep, finished in grey cladding, with a four-pane window. A flat roof dormer is proposed to the rear of the dwelling 6.6m wide, 2.3m high and 3.7m deep, finished in grey cladding, with two sets of windows. A single storey rear extension with a flat roof and roof lantern is also proposed 4.7m deep, 3.1m high to the flat roof and 3.4m high to the roof lantern, and 7.3m wide. The extension would be finished in render and would have a window and a door on the rear elevation.
5. I note that the hip to gable extension was not the subject of the refusal reason, no doubt part of the reason for that relates to permitted development rights. Indeed, as part of the appellant's appeal statement, I am told that the council has issued a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development Certificate (reference 24/01640/CLP) for 'Hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer to form habitable accommodation and rooflights to front'. This was on the basis that the proposal constitutes permitted

development under the provisions of Classes A, B, C and G of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). In addition, it appears that planning permission has been given (24/01639/FUL) to 'Erect single storey rear extension with rooflight and alteration to side elevation'.

6. Therefore, the refusal of the rear dormer is not justified, on the basis that the rear dormer is permitted development. Thus, I am left to consider the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the streetscene and the wider surrounding area.
7. As paragraph 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states, *"Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise"*. Policy DM3 (part 4) of the Development Management Document 2015 (DMD) states that: *"The conversion or redevelopment of single storey dwellings (bungalows) will generally be resisted. Exceptions will be considered where the proposal: (i) Does not create an unacceptable juxtaposition within the streetscene that would harm the character and appearance of the area: and ... "*
8. The Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide, Supplementary Planning Document 1 2009 (SPD), states, in respect of dormers, within para 366: *"Dormer windows, where appropriate, should appear incidental in the roof slope (i.e. set in from both side walls, set well below the ridgeline and well above the eaves). The position of the new opening should correspond with the rhythm and align with existing fenestration on lower floors. (Note: one central dormer may also be an appropriate alternative.) The size of any new dormer windows, particularly on the front and side elevations, should be smaller to those on lower floors and the materials should be sympathetic to the existing property. The space around the window must be kept to a minimum. Large box style dormers should be avoided, especially where they have public impact, as they appear bulky and unsightly. Smaller individual dormers are preferred"*.
9. The SPD is not part of the development plan, but is subject to consultation, and sets out in more detail policy or policies in the development plan. In this case, although pre-dating the DMD, it is in accord with that document and the emphasis in the NPPF on the importance of good design.
10. As already noted, Glenwood Avenue is mixed in character. There are a variety of roof forms, including hipped and gabled roofs, as well as front dormers. The existing front dormers include those that have existed before current policy was adopted, but in a good number of cases reflect the reasons for the policies mentioned, that are intended to raise the design quality of the built environment and avoid a poor and incongruous relationship between buildings and new additions.
11. In the appeal case, the bungalow is modest in scale, with a relatively small front roof slope, and would remain so with the hip to gable extension. The proposed front dormer would sit close to the ridge. Its flat roof design and size mean that it would appear dominant and bulky, and would not relate well to the dwelling as proposed to be extended. The dormer would be wide and would not align with the ground floor window, and the spaces each side of the glazed area add to the apparent bulk.

12. I conclude that the proposed front dormer would be of poor design, would not relate well to the bungalow as proposed to be enlarged and would be harmful to the streetscene. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the examples of front dormers along Glenwood Avenue; these do not lead me to a different decision for the reasons already mentioned. As a result, this element of the appeal proposal would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM1 and DM3 of the DMD and the advice contained within the National Design Guide (2021) and the SPD.
13. For these reasons the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR