



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2022

by K Winnard LL.B (Hons) Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W1525/D/22/3308832

12 Roughtons Galleywood Chelmsford Essex CM2 8PF

- 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 Martin Blake against the decision of Chelmsford City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01176/FUL, dated 16 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front and side extension and replacement window
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council amended the description of the development and I note that the applicant's agent has also utilised this description on the appeal form. I have used the Council's description as this provides a more accurate description of the development.
3. The proposed development consists of a number of elements. I note that the proposal to convert the garage was removed from the application. The Council has also indicated that it has no objections to the first floor side extension. I agree with the Council on this matter and accordingly shall direct my assessment to the first floor front extension in my decision.
4. Planning permission has been granted previously for a first floor side extension. At the time of my visit construction works were taking place.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property, 12 Roughtons, (No 12) is one of a pair of semi-detached two storey dormer dwellings, located in a residential area. The dwellings within the area as a whole have a wide variety of design and style. However, in the case of No 12, the dwelling forms part of a small group of six similarly designed semi-detached properties. This group of dwellings, whilst all of a modest form

and size, form a cohesive group of development on the northern side of Roughtons. They are characterised in the streetscene by their distinctive features of front box dormers, modest front porches and side garages. These features add to the variety of the general street scene in this location.

7. The addition of a first floor front extension over the porch to create a gable would result in an alien feature to the front elevation. It would add bulk and together with the proposed contrast in materials, would be overly dominant to the pair of semi-detached dwellings. Rather than enhancing the appearance of No 12, it would be incongruous to the underlying pattern of development within this group of dwellings. It would also disrupt the regularity of single storey front porches found generally in this location. As such it would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
8. The design of the extension would be a gable end to the road and would align with the overall height and roof profile. However it would disrupt the symmetry between the pair of semi detached dwellings and the group of dwellings as a whole. Accordingly it would result in an unbalanced and discordant appearance. The use and extent of render proposed, whilst a contemporary feature, would be the first of its kind in this group of dwellings. The coherence of the group would be lost and as such it would emphasise what would be an overly bulky addition to No 12 which would fail to respect the proportions of the existing dwelling.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such it would be contrary to Policy DM23 of the Chelmsford Local Plan which requires development to be compatible with the character and appearance of the area and to the host building in terms of amongst other things, scale, form, materials and detailing. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given and having taken all matters into account, I dismiss the appeal.

K Winnard

INSPECTOR