
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: 23 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/25/3372835

46 Clyde Crescent, Rayleigh, Essex SS6 7SU

- 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 Nicole Payne against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00128/FUL.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear and front flat roofed dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The decision notice raised no concern with the proposed rear dormer. Given its location on the rear roofscape and permitted development fallback, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's findings. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow in a residential area. Whilst there is a commonality between properties in that they are predominantly bungalows, many have undergone historical alterations and extensions with many featuring front dormers with both flat and pitched roofs of varying scales and design. Flat-roof front dormers are thus a prevailing characteristic of the streetscene in this locality.
4. The proposed front dormer would reflect those seen on surrounding properties insofar as being of a flat-roof design, set down from the ridge and spanning a similar width. Therefore, although the Supplementary Planning Document 2 - Housing Design (SPD2) seeks a pitched roof to front dormers, considering the surrounding roof-forms, I do not find the flat-roof design in itself incongruous or out of character in this particular locality.
5. However, SPD2 also advises that dormer windows should retain sufficient roof verge around the window, and the Essex Design Guide requires dormers to be incidental to the roof space. Notwithstanding my earlier comments regarding the flat-roof design, the proposed front dormer would have a very limited setback from the eaves, at odds with surrounding front dormers in the street which are set noticeably further back. The lack of a setback would harmfully increase the visual bulk and massing of the dormer, and, rather than appearing incidental, it would

appear as an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling and within the wider streetscene.

6. Whilst the appellant considers the proposal would assist in achieving uniformity with the adjoining property, which has a front dormer, given the lack of setback it would fail to achieve this. The front of the proposed dormer would be set further forward than the neighbouring dormer, and therefore, this argument does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
7. In support of the proposal, the appellant has drawn my attention to two other approved front flat-roof dormers at 83 Clyde Crescent and 48 Louis Drive. In both examples, I do not have any drawings, thus I cannot be certain how the massing of those schemes compares to the proposal before me. These decisions do not, therefore, alter my findings above. Moreover, at paragraph 5.5 of the Officer Report for 83 Clyde Street, it states that ample roof verge would still be provided around all sides of the dormer, which is not the case in this scheme.
8. For the reasons above, the proposed front dormer would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and area, in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Development Management Plan (2014) which seeks development that positively contributes to the surrounding natural and built environment and with SPD2 and the Essex Design Guide.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR