

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2017

by Timothy C King BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23rd January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/16/3163162

92 Thames Crescent, Corringham, Essex, SS17 9DZ

- 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 Kirsty Mullem against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01110/FUL dated 8 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is *'First floor extension into existing loft space including extending front existing dormer and rear flat roof dormers and insertion of new first floor side window.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the widening of both the existing front and rear dormer roof extensions and the installation of a new first floor side window at 92 Thames Crescent, Corringham, Essex, SS17 9DZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 16/01110/FUL, dated 8 August 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 1506/01, 1506/02 Rev D and 1506/LP.
 - iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has raised an objection only in respect of the widening of the existing dormer extension to the front roofslope, and does not take issue with the enlargement of the rear dormer extension nor the proposed side window. I agree with this approach and, accordingly, I will limit my assessment to that of the proposed front dormer
 3. I have slightly changed the proposal's description to focus more closely on the actual development involved.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a post-war semi-detached dormer bungalow, characteristic of Thames Crescent as a whole, whose properties show a variety of front dormer extensions. A number of these appear to have been altered and extended over time and there are several examples of front dormers occupying the majority of their street-facing roofslopes. The proposal seeks to widen the bungalow's front roof extension, not heighten it, and the resultant structure would still be set in from both flanks, and set in from the eaves and below ridge height. The increase in width would be to an approximate 2.42m.
6. In the above context I cannot agree with the Council's objection, in its decision notice, whereby size, scale, mass and design have been mentioned. In the circumstances I have described only the matter of 'size' could be reasonably considered as a ground for objection, and this is only an issue given that the adjoining bungalow, No 90, has a front dormer which is virtually identical in form and width to that of No 92. As such, I accept the Council's argument that the proposal would result in an imbalance between the said properties. Nonetheless, I have to balance this loss of symmetry with any visual harm that would be a consequence of extending the dormer.
7. Policies PMD2 and CSTPP22 of the Thurrock Local Development Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (LDCS) require, amongst other things, that new development should respect its immediate context. From walking along the street and observing a proliferation of front dormers of varying size, some of which are original features, the guidance mentioned in Annexe A1 of the Thurrock Borough Local Plan that front dormers should not occupy more than 25% of the roofslope has been frequently breached. That is not to say, of course, that this particular guidance has ceased to have relevance borough-wide, but in the context of Thames Crescent's existing roof extensions its applicability is lessened.
8. In weighing up the effect of widening the dormer extension, on balance, I do not consider that the loss of symmetry in the size of adjoining properties' front dormer extensions, consequential from the proposal, would create significant harm to either the appearance of the host dwelling nor the street's characteristic roofscape. Each case must be taken on its own merits and, in this particular instance, given that the extended dormer would remain set into the roofplane I am satisfied that the development would integrate within the streetscene.
9. I thereby conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of either the host dwelling nor the surrounding area and there would be no material conflict with the aims of LDCS Policies PMD2 or CSTPP22.
10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In addition to the statutory time limit, in the interests of certainty I impose a condition requiring that the development be implemented only in

accordance with the approved plans. Also, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose an additional condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR