



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/25/3366219

16 Woodville Close, Rochford, Essex SS4 1SN

- 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 Reece Franklyn against the decision of Rochford District Council .
 - The application Ref is 25/00033/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion incorporating pitched roofed front dormers, rear dormer, removal of existing conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion incorporating pitched roofed front dormers, rear dormer, removal of existing conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension at 16 Woodville Close, Rochford, Essex SS4 1SN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00033/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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1609/1 Rev 1,
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a semi-detached bungalow located in a close made up of similarly scaled bungalows, most of which have been the subject of alteration and extension, including approximately half of them by the addition of front box-dormer extensions. This results in a streetscene where little of the original consistency of similarly scaled and designed bungalows is evident.
4. The proposal is to demolish an existing conservatory and extend the property mainly to the rear, including a rear box dormer extension. Along with a proposed front dormer extension, this would allow for the creation of additional living space at loft level. This front dormer would take the form of a pair of pitched roof dormer

windows, connected by a slightly set back flat roof infill between the two. The proposed front dormer extension would be centrally positioned on the front roof slope and set down from the existing roof ridge, with substantial roof verges to the sides and below.

5. The design of the proposed front dormer is the appellants response to a previously refused application¹ for a similar set of extensions to the appeal dwelling. This was refused due to the design of a proposed front box-dormer extension, that would have been similar in design but larger in scale than the many other front box-dormer extensions to bungalows in the close, including at the appeal dwellings semi-detached pair.
6. Rochford District Council Supplementary Planning Document 2: Housing Design (2007) (the SPD) advises that extensions must be harmonious in character, with the existing dwelling, and have regard to the visual impact on the appearance of the streetscene. In particular it advised that front dormer extensions respect the scale, form, and character of the existing dwelling and ensure that substantial roof verges are maintained at the sides and below any projecting dormer. The Essex Design Guide (2018-as updated), recommends that two individual dormer window extensions with roofs that hip with the original roof rather than a single box dormer extension, are more appropriate on front roof slopes.
7. The proposal is significantly smaller in scale than the previously refused proposal and the box dormers on the front roof slopes of other nearby bungalows. In this instance the proposal would have the visual appearance of two dormer windows, albeit connected by a small flat roofed element. A design approach evident in some more recent front dormer extensions in the wider area. Within the context of the surrounding plethora of box dormer extensions, the proposal would appear as secondary, subservient and reflective of the simple design of the appeal dwelling.
8. The design guidance given in the EDG is advice that should be applied to the individual circumstances, and I find the visual difference between two separate dormer windows without a connecting flat roof element and that of the proposal with this element is negligible within the context of the existing bungalow and surrounding box dormer dominated surroundings. As such, the proposal would accord with the aims, objectives and design advice given in the SPD and the EDG . As such, I find that the proposal would appear as a complementary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling, giving the frontal appearance of a proportionate and well balanced dormer bungalow.
9. From my site visit, it was evident that the majority of bungalows in the close have been the subject of front dormer extensions that demonstrate a variety of scale, design and cladding materials. Such dormers have become an evident local characteristic and established part of the local streetscene. Given the number of front and rear dormer extensions that are evident in street views from Woodville Close, including of properties in the close as well as surrounding streets, the appeal proposal would appear to reflect this established street scene. Therefore, the proposal would be complementary to the local streetscene and would reflect established character and appearance of the local area.

¹ Planning Ref: 24/00291/FUL

10. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would accord with Policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Development Management Plan (2014), which seeks development that promotes the character of the locality and have a positive relationship with nearby buildings.

Conditions

11. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawing and materials that match existing

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR