
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2016

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 19 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/16/3154633

22 Whitmore Crescent, Springfield, Chelmsford, Essex CM2 6YN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Bency Joseph against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/00515/FUL was refused by notice dated 17 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is a double-storey extension to the front of the property. Demolish existing front façade to incorporate a 3m extension to the north west of the house to enhance the living room, study, dining room and master bedroom with an ensuite bathroom. Reuse all doors and windows if under the current regulations. Alteration to the front driveway and boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies on a prominent corner location within a primarily residential modern estate. There is a variety of design of dwellings in the area, with different roof details including front gables. There is a general harmony of design and layout. Where there are front gables they have primarily steep pitched roofs as part of the original property.
 4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a steep pitched roof and has a balanced frontage with two bay windows either side of the front door. The proposal includes a part single-storey, part two-storey front extension. It would be some 3 metres in depth with the two-storey element having a width of some 5.2 metres. There would be a very shallow pitched roof over this two-storey section, with a front gable.
 5. Due to the bulk, position, scale and design of the proposal, particularly the shallow pitched roof and forward position, I consider that the proposal would appear as an incongruous and dominant addition, not in keeping with the character of the host dwelling. The existing dwelling would be overwhelmed by
-

the proposed front extension and the different roof configurations would appear awkward and contrived. In such a prominent position, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the wider streetscene.

6. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including the appellants suggestion to steepen the proposed front pitched roof. I do not consider this would alleviate my concerns above, particularly with regard to the different roof configurations on the appeal property.
7. I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policies DC45 and DC47 in the Chelmsford Borough Council Core Strategy and Development Control Policies (2008), where they seek to ensure that new development has an appropriate visual relationship with its setting and does not adversely affect the character and appearance of an area. I consider these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR