



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 November 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/B5480/D/20/3253998

6 Chelsworth Drive, Romford RM3 0ES

- 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 Craven against the decision of the London Borough of Havering Council.
 - The application Ref P0396.20, dated 17 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Proposed loft conversion including front and rear dormers with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Chelsworth Drive broadly consists of semi-detached two storey houses on one side of the road and bungalows on the other, with short spur roads leading off to smaller cul-du-sacs. The appeal bungalow is semi-detached and is already imbalanced as the attached neighbour has erected a front projecting extension. Although front dormer windows are not uncommon features within the street scene, they are not a prevalent characteristic.
4. The scale of the proposed front dormer, its positioning that would extend just below the ridge line, projection and width as a combination, would appear as an incongruous feature to the roofscape. It would neither be in proportion to the host roof slope or subservient to it, and would thus appear as a discordant addition.
5. The sizes of other front dormers may not precisely comply with the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. However, I have not been provided with details of the planning history of these other developments. There are dormers located within the front roof slope of two-story houses, however as that is not the same dwelling type to the one before me, it is therefore not the same circumstances.

6. The size of the proposed rear dormer would dominate the existing roofscape as it would encompass the whole roof slope, it would not be positioned well back from the eaves line or set in from the sides. Given its largescale massing, the rear dormer would be visible from Chelsworth Drive through the large gap between it and the adjacent bungalow. It would also be highly visible from Chelsworth Close. Overall, it would appear as a discordant and obtrusive feature within the street scene and could not be described as similar to the rear dormer at No 4 Chelsworth Drive as this is a considerably smaller scale.
7. There may be a fall-back position with respect to erecting a rear dormer window. However, the appellants have not provided me with the precise details to allow me to accurately consider whether or not it could be permitted development. Therefore, as is my duty, I have considered the proposal before me.
8. To conclude, the proposal would result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the area and would not comply with the aims of Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 to respect local character, and Policy DC61 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Control Policies Development Plan Document 2008 in its design aims.

Other Matters

9. Within the scope of this appeal, I am unable to comment on suggested amendments to the scheme. These should be referred to the Council for consideration.

Conclusion

10. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR