



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

**Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 3 December 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/19/3234908**

**31 Waverley Crescent, Runwell, Wickford SS11 7LN**

- 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 Mr & Mrs N Leavitt against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
  - The application Ref 19/01003/FUL, dated 5 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
  - The development is a proposed rear dormer extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

### Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a 1.5 storey semi-detached dwelling within an established residential area, with a rear pitched roof gable end and flat roof dormer. There is a mix of architectural styles and building sizes in the vicinity. There are bungalows, some of which are semi-detached like the appeal property, modest chalet-style dwellings, as well as larger detached two-storey dwellings. On my site visit, I noted many properties on the southern side of Waverley Crescent had rear extensions and flat roof dormers.
  5. The proposal will result in a first-floor flat roof rear extension that would extend out from the current flat roof dormer, replacing nearly the entirety of the existing gable end. The resulting depth and scale of the extension would appear excessive and disproportionate considering the modest size of the appeal property. Although the appellant states the development is functionally designed and would align with the building line at No. 29, it would unbalance the scale and roof form of the property. The removal of the pitched gable end would also have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property and would thus constitute poor design.
-

6. I acknowledge there are many flat roof rear dormers in the area. However, the depth of the proposed rear extension would be markedly larger and awkward and would therefore differ noticeably from other rear extensions in the area, including the dormers at the adjacent property at No 33. The appellant refers to No. 33 Lindon Road, to the south of the appeal site, which has a large two-storey flat roof rear extension. It is an unusual building which I consider to be an anomaly in this context, and which does not affect my view that the proposed development would harm the appearance of the appeal property and the predominant character of the area.
7. I also recognise that the development would not be visible in the street scene. Whilst this limits its impact on the character of the area, it does not mitigate it and it would still be visible from a number of nearby properties.
8. I therefore find the proposed extension would not be compatible with the existing dwelling and will result in a visually discordant feature that would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed development would conflict with policies DC45 and DC47 of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the surrounding area in which they lie.

#### **Other matters**

9. The appellant states that the development would not impact the living conditions of neighbouring residents, but even so, an absence of harm in this regard could not lend positive weight to the proposal.
10. I acknowledge that the proposal would improve living conditions by providing increased living space, and this may provide an economic benefit. However, these considerations would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

#### **Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Thomas Courtney*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

#### **Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*Andrew Owen*

INSPECTOR