



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/25/3372655

7 Southview Road, Hockley, Essex SS5 5DX

- 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 Marney against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00334/FUL.
 - The development proposed is to erect hip to gable roof enlargement, dormers the front and rear, balustrade over existing single storey rear extension to form balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Erect hip to gable roof enlargement, dormers the front and rear, balustrade over existing single storey rear extension to form balcony at 7 Southview Road, Hockley, Essex SS5 5DX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00334/FUL, 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 nos 01 – Existing and Proposed Site Plans & 03A – Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The 1.7 metre high privacy screening to the balcony as shown on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed and shall be retained for the lifetime of the development thereafter.

Main Issue

2. The Council's refusal of planning permission relates solely to the front dormer windows. From all I have observed and read I have no reason to come to an alternative view with regards to the hip to gable roof enlargement, rear dormer and balcony. Therefore, the focus of this appeal is on the front dormer windows.
3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormers on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached, single-storey dwelling, similar to surrounding properties. The roof forms of properties along Southview Road are of

varying designs, including hipped and gabled pitched roofs, with many featuring front dormer windows that vary in their spacing and design. Accordingly, there is not a consistent built rhythm to the street scene; with the variety an inherent part of the road's character.

5. I am mindful of the Essex Design Guide and Supplementary Planning Document 2 – Housing Design, which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that dormer windows are incidental to the roof space, retain sufficient roof verge to the sides and that front dormers have pitched roofs.
6. The proposal would comprise two pitched-roof, front dormers, each with a hipped gable. This design reflects the hipped gable on the ground floor of the existing property, as well as those I observed on other properties in the area, including the neighbouring properties (Nos 9 and 11).
7. The two dormers would be positioned close together, with the eaves touching. Whilst dormers on properties in the area typically have more generous spacing between them, there are examples of dormers positioned in close proximity to each other, including at the adjacent property (No 9). The positioning would not, therefore, appear harmfully incongruous and would contribute to the varied character of roofscapes in the locality.
8. Whilst the dormers would include a link element, which is not a common characteristic, the close proximity of the two dormers and the set back of the link from the front edge of the dormers, ensures it would not be a highly visible feature. The link would not appear as a prominent addition, with the dormers still appearing as two distinct elements. Moreover, given the proposed dormers' design with their pitched roofs, set back from the eaves and inset from the side of the roof, the dormers as a whole, including the link element, would remain subordinate to the host dwelling. They would not appear excessive in scale or bulk, either on the host dwelling or within the wider street scene, in accordance with the forementioned design guidance.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed front dormers would not appear as an incongruous addition and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or area. As such, the proposal would accord with Policy CP1 of the Rochford District Council Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Development Management Plan (2014) which, together, seek good design that has regard to the surrounding context and character of the locality and maintains a positive relation with existing and nearby buildings.

Other Matter

10. Privacy concerns have been raised regarding the proposed rear balcony. The submitted plans detail a 1.7metre high privacy screen on the eastern side of the proposed rear balcony. I am satisfied that the height of the screen would prevent any harmful overlooking. Furthermore, a suitably worded condition can be imposed to ensure that the screening is obscurely glazed and would remain in place for the lifetime of the development.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard conditions requiring a time limit for commencement of development and adherence to the approved plans, a condition requiring the use of external materials to match the existing building is considered necessary and reasonable. This is in the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the area. To ensure acceptable levels of privacy are maintained, a condition is necessary requiring privacy screening to the balcony.
12. The Parish Council have suggested that conditions are imposed for parking and construction vehicles. The proposed development would retain three parking spaces to the front of the property in accordance with the Essex County Council Parking Guidance (2024). A condition requiring this is therefore not necessary. Whilst there may be some disturbance during construction, given the limited scale of the development this would only be for a short period. Therefore, a condition requiring construction parking would not be reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR