

To / Sukhi Dhadwar  
From / Frederique Caillat  
Date / 29<sup>th</sup> May 2020  
Your ref / EPF/0891/20  
Our ref /  
File ref / 016914



ADDRESS // 83 BELL COMMON EPPING, ESSEX CM16 4DZ  
PROPOSAL // PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING SIDE ROOF DORMER & REPLACE WITH THE SAME, BUT SMALLER.

### **Initial Remark**

We question the submission of yet another application when previous planning application and pre-application reports and an Inspector's report have already clearly expressed views on this development. If there had been any way forward that could have been found acceptable, without having to relocate it (as approved originally), this would have been communicated to the applicant when the retrospective application was submitted in 2017, ref. EPF/2955/17.

In addition, we feel that the wording of the proposal does not reflect correctly the proposed design. After reviewing the submitted plans, it appears that there is no reduction in size but only a change of the roof slope, from a catslide roof to a nearly flat roof.

### **Context**

83 Bell Common is a modern dwelling built in 2017 within the Bell Common Conservation Area.

### **Relevant planning history**

- In 2016, permission was granted for the demolition of the late twentieth century two storey detached dwelling house on the site, to be replaced with a three storey detached dwelling (EPF/2829/16). The original house was nestled between two adjacent houses with the gable end to the street and with the ridge line set down.
- In 2017, a retrospective application was submitted (EPF/2955/17) as the side roof dormer had not been constructed in accordance with approved drawings. This application was refused and a subsequent appeal lodged.
- In 2019 (September), the appeal was dismissed. The inspector agreed with the officers concerns and felt that, due to its size and position, the dormer was not subordinate to the roof slope and protruded significantly. The Inspector also mentioned in the report that the spatial and visual prominence of the dormer window was reinforced by the fact that the new dwelling had been built significantly higher than approved on plans and therefore stands significantly higher than the buildings directly adjacent to it.
- An enforcement notice was applied to the unlawful works and the applicant was given until 9<sup>th</sup> November 2019 to rectify the situation. No works have been started to date.
- In 2019 (October), a pre-application (EPF/2019/ENQ/00963) was submitted to seek advice regarding amending the unlawful dormer window. The sharp angled appearance of the proposed flat roof of the dormer was considered even more harmful than the existing appearance. The overly large size of the face of the dormer and its position on the roof slope remained not addressed.

*m e m o*

Comments on the present scheme

We would like, once again, to reiterate our previous concerns. This application is for a change of the roof slope, from a catslide roof to a nearly flat roof.

As expressed in our pre-application response, we feel that the only element that has been addressed by this new scheme is the increase in distance that the dormer now sits away from the ridge line. This has been achieved by squaring the dormer, which was originally designed as a catslide. The sharp angled appearance of the very shallow roof is considered even more harmful than the existing appearance, as it gives a very “boxy” appearance to the dormer window. This makes the dormer protrudes even more.

The overly large size of the face of the dormer and its position on the roof slope has still not been dealt with. As mention previously in this comment, the inspector has agreed with the officers concerns in his appeal report and felt that, due to its size and position, the dormer was not subordinate to the roof slope and protruded significantly. The Inspector also mentioned in his report that the spatial and visual prominence of the dormer window was reinforced by the fact that the new dwelling had been built significantly higher than approved on plans and therefore stands significantly higher than the buildings directly adjacent to it.

Conclusion

We, therefore, recommend this application to be REFUSED and the dormer window to be altered or rebuilt to conform to the small and subservient catslide dormer approved in 2016. This is in line with the 2017 recommendation for refusal and the Inspector report (2019).

This is supported by policies HC6 and HC7 of our Local Plan and Alterations (1998 and 2006), policy DM7 of our Submission Version Local Plan (2017), and paragraphs 190, 192, 193 and 194 of the NPPF (2019).

Comparison

 <p>Proposed South-West Facing Elevation</p> <p>No. 83 Bell Common</p>	 <p>Proposed South-West Facing Elevation</p> <p>No. 83 Bell Common</p>	 <p>Proposed South-West Facing Elevation</p> <p>No. 83 Bell Common</p>
As approved, ref. EPF/2829/16	As built	As proposed