



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2021

by Mark Philpott BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/21/3277874

72 Henniker Gate, Springfield, Chelmsford CM2 6SB

- 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 Miss Katherine Brenda Game against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01427/FUL, dated 9 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'dorma in loft space with ensuite shower room'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was revised on 20 July 2021. It replaces the version from 2019 that the Council considered when it determined the application. Having regard to the limited differences between the 2 versions of the Framework in respect of the specific issues in dispute for this appeal, it has not been necessary to seek the views of the parties regarding this matter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site includes a 2 storey dwellinghouse that forms part of a building comprising 4 properties. The site is located within a cul-de-sac which spurs from the main part of the Henniker Gate highway and serves a small number of properties. The area is characterised primarily by dwellings with pitched and gabled roofs.
5. The Making Places – Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides guidance relating to roof alterations. Amongst other things, it sets out that dormers should not be overly dominant, disrupt the host building's roof form or be introduced in areas with long runs of roofs devoid of dormers. It also explains that dormer windows on front roof slopes should be of a modest size and traditional design providing light rather than headroom or extra floorspace.
6. The proposed roof dormer would extend across the majority of the dwelling's roof plane and be prominent within the cul-de-sac. Furthermore, there would

be glimpsed views of the dormer from the junction between the cul-de-sac and the main part of the highway. Comparable front dormers are not evident in the immediate vicinity of the site, with the area being mostly devoid of roof alterations. The dormer would be a large and disproportionate addition relative to the size of the dwelling and the building overall. It would disrupt the building's pitched roof form and appear incongruous in the area. For these reasons, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area.

7. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy DM23 of the Chelmsford Local Plan, which requires extensions to be compatible with the character and appearance of the area. It also conflicts with Chapter 12 of the Framework, which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of an area and is sympathetic of local character. In addition, the proposal conflicts with the SPD, as it does not conform to the guidance on roof alterations.
8. I note that the proposal is sought to increase the amount of space in the dwelling and improve the living conditions of its existing and future occupiers. I also acknowledge that local residents have not objected to the scheme. However, these matters do not reduce the conflict with the above policies and guidance or outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. Material considerations do not outweigh the proposal's conflict with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Philpott

INSPECTOR