



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025 by K Hole BA (Hons)

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/25/3362525

48 Louis Drive, Rayleigh, Essex SS6 9DX

- 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 Kevin Bingham against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00667/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with front and rear dormers at 48 Louis Drive, Rayleigh, Essex SS6 9DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00667/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no. 4154-09.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located within a residential area of Rayleigh. On my site visit I observed that many of the properties on Louis Drive and on the surrounding roads appear to have been altered and extended from their original form. Consequently, the character and appearance of the street scene and surrounding area is diverse in terms of layout, scale and design.
5. The appeal property sits within a row of semi-detached bungalows that are of similar scale and design. The exception to this, two doors along from the appeal property is 44 Louis Drive which has a front and rear dormer with a flat roof that

extends above the ridge height of the dwelling, and a front porch with pitched roof which projects forward of the front elevation.

6. The proposed development would include the construction of a front and rear dormer to the existing bungalow to create additional living space within the roof. The Rochford District Council Housing Design SPD provides guidance on the design of dormers and recommends the use of pitched roofs on front and side dormers. While the proposed front dormer would have a flat roof, the design would respect the appearance of the existing bungalow as it would not extend the full width of the dwelling, project above the ridge height or beyond the roof. Although it would increase the scale and mass of the existing bungalow, it would not amount to an incongruous addition and would complement its character and appearance.
7. In addition to the front and rear dormer, the proposed development would involve a hip to gable extension to the roof. The proposed development would therefore as a whole, unbalance the visual uniformity of the pair of semi-detached bungalows in which the appeal property is located. However, given the diversity of the wider street scene which presently includes a mixture of bungalows, bungalows with both flat roof and pitched roof dormers and two-storey dwellings, the proposed development would cause no harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. The proposed development would therefore accord with policy DM1 of Rochford District Council's Development Management Plan (2014) which requires development to promote the character of the locality ensuring that it positively contributes to the surrounding built environment. Part (x) specifically requires a positive relationship with existing and nearby dwellings.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of the development, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans to provide certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing dwelling in the interests of safeguarding the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

K Hole

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR