



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/25/3366691

225 Stock Road, Billericay, Essex CM12 0SG

- 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 Cristina Naulls against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00300/FULL.
 - The development proposed is replacement of first floor box dormer roof with the part addition of a gable roof projection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of first floor box dormer roof with the part addition of a gable roof projection at 225 Stock Road, Billericay, Essex CM12 0SG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00300/FULL, 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 Sheet Number 1 existing and proposed plan, section and elevation except in respect of the proposed side elevation showing the incorrect ridge height of the dormer, which should instead accord with the proposed roof plan detail.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding street scene.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to the front of a semi-detached, chalet bungalow situated within a built-up part of Billericay and facing onto Stock Road. This street contains a varied mix of detached and semi-detached houses, chalet style houses, and bungalows, many of which have been extended or remodelled with different architectural styles.
4. Whilst removing the visual symmetry of the existing semi-detached pair, the replacement dormer window proposed is not so large as to appear overly dominant. Remaining subservient in scale to the host property, and of a comparable design to that immediately next door at No. 223A, the dormer would not look unduly incongruous. The flat roofed element would extend towards the semi-detached neighbour, retaining some coherence to that side of the front elevation. There would be no visual harm in the flat roof extending slightly further along the roof towards No. 225A, or with the off-centre window in the taller, pitched roof part, as

the overall fenestration to the extended dwelling would appear satisfactorily balanced and arranged. No. 225 would no longer read as one of a matching pair of semi-detached chalets, but as a distinct design which would provide an acceptable transition between the dwellings to either side.

5. Accordingly, this proposal causes no material harm to the character of the surrounding area and complies with Policy BAS BE12 of the Adopted Local Plan. Additionally, the proposal accords with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect to its aims to ensure developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusion

6. In addition to one applying the standard three-year time limit for commencement, a second condition is necessary in the interests of certainty establishing the approved drawings. This is caveated not to apply to the proposed side extension shown, which erroneously indicates the ridge height of the dormer roof matching that of the main dwelling. The remainder of the drawings are as intended and ensure the new roof structure is subserviently designed, by returning at a lower level to the main roof ridge. A new side window onto a staircase, smaller than the one it replaces, would face a blank garage wall at next door No. 223A. A further condition requiring this be obscure glazed is not deemed necessary, as no harmful degree of overlooking would arise from this proposal. Subject to these two conditions, I conclude the appeal succeeds.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR