



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by **Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/25/3366292

14 Hillside Road, Billericay, Essex CM11 2DA

- 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 Mr Neil Jones against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01022/FULL.
 - The development proposed is to demolish garage and part of existing rear projection, and construction of two storey side and rear extension, hip to gable roof extension along with raising the ridge height to incorporate accommodation in the roof, and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposal on
 - the character and appearance of the area and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers at 16 Hillside Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property lies in a part of Hillside Road comprising frontage housing set back to a quite even building line behind modestly sized front gardens, many taken up by car parking. The dwellings generally fit quite snugly in plots of quite similar widths; some having been extended over drive space at the side. The street scene is one of closely but not tightly spaced suburban housing of a generally medium size. The mixture of houses and bungalows display a variety of sizes and architectural styles, mostly detached, but do not contrast discordantly in scale, height and character.
4. No 14 and its neighbour at No 16 are of the same original hipped roof design and neither appear to have been significantly altered or enlarged. Both retain the space for drives to the side, although that at No 16 now serves a recent development of quite large houses on land to the rear. These are set back at a lower elevation and do not form part of the street scene along Hillside Road.
5. As with other nearby examples cited, this proposal would extend the existing dwelling to the side, removing the garage and building over the existing drive. The proposals would result in a major increase in the size of dwelling, through a

combination of raising the eaves height significantly, creating a deeper plan and replacing a hipped roof with taller, gable ends at each side.

6. The plans finally determined had evidently involved some concessions during the course of negotiations. To address the Council's concerns, the side extension had been set back 2.3 metres from the front elevation of the main part of the house, with the ridge of its roof stepped down 0.5 metres, to make it subordinate in scale. Furthermore, a separation distance of one metre from the boundary with No 16 had been provided, an increase from the 0.8 metres originally proposed. However, the extension would be subordinate only to a substantially enlarged main part of the house. The appellant has calculated the ridge height of the roof is raised by 0.6 metres, not the 1.8 metres referred to by the Council in support of its decision. However, this roof would rest on significantly raised eaves, be to a much greater plan area and form part of a substantially enlarged dwelling.
7. The greater height, coupled with wider gabled sides replacing a narrower, hipped roof, would lead to a large increase in scale and overall mass. A visual comparison of the existing and proposed elevations clearly shows a substantially larger dwelling is proposed, significantly greater in height and size than the existing house. Hillside Road is at a gradient, such that its topography already raises the height of No 14 above that of No 16. Even allowing for such natural changes in level, the resulting dwelling would appear harmfully out of scale with the dwellings at either side and appear anomalous within its street scene setting, detracting significantly from the character and appearance of the area.

Living conditions

8. The proposal would adhere to the Council's 45-degree open outlook requirements from neighbouring windows and result in no significant loss of privacy or light. However, from their garden, the occupiers at No 16 would experience at close quarters a substantial increase in the scale, height and mass of a dwelling currently the same size as their own. The impact of this, particularly the close range view of an expansive gable end, would be quite over-bearing, detracting appreciably from the quality of living conditions currently provided at this next-door property.

Conclusions

9. The adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area, and the living conditions at No 16, would conflict with saved Policy BAS BE 12 of the Council's Local Plan¹. This is specifically in regard to the harm caused to the character of the street scene and from the proposal's over-dominant visual impacts. This policy remains consistent with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework in ensuring developments add to the overall quality of an area, are sympathetic to its character and create places with a high standard of amenity for existing and future residents.
10. The principle of extending the dwelling is not in dispute, and the Council has allowed enlargements to other nearby homes along Hillside Road, some of which are cited by the appellant in support of this proposal. The extensions permitted at No 4 are somewhat comparable in scale to this case, although the end result here appears to suitably reflect the prevailing height and footprint of the original dwelling and the scale of the houses at either side. The small dwelling allowed opposite to

¹ Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies 2007

No 14, attached to No 19, fits in well with the scale and design of the original semi-detached pair of houses and is hardly comparable to this scheme. The replacement dwelling allowed at No 32, with a road junction at one side, is substantially larger than the next-door bungalow at No 34. However, it's roof is hipped at the sides, helping to avoid any unduly overbearing or over dominant impacts. The extensions allowed at No 38 appear to be an elongation of a two-storey rear addition to a bungalow. However, this keeps the same hipped roofing at the sides, without the same extent of increased mass through tall, gable end additions, as proposed in this case.

11. None of these nearby examples are sufficiently similar in nature to justify the harm found from this proposal or offer the support necessary to outweigh the conflict found with national and development plan policy. Even if these other examples were in anyway comparable, it remains well-established practice that each planning case be considered primarily on its own, individual merits. This proposal would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions provided at No 16. As a consequence, I conclude the appeal does not succeed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR