
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/17/3166879

27 Cecil Avenue, Chafford Hundred, Grays, Essex RM16 6QA

- 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 Kevin Barrett against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01180/HHA was refused by notice dated 19 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is to reconstruct pitched roof to provide second floor rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a primarily residential area within a row of modern two-storey dwellings of uniform design and scale. I consider the uniformity of this group of detached dwellings makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 4. The proposal would increase the height of the roof by some 1.7 metres. There would be two pitched roof dormers in the rear elevation and one in the front elevation. From my observations, due to the increase in ridge and chimney height, together with the proposed dormers, the proposal would appear as an incongruous addition to the otherwise uniform character and appearance of this group of dwellings. Whilst the frontage would be prominent within the streetscene in Cecil Road, the increase in height and the rear dormers would be visible to some extent from public view within Drake Road.
 5. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised including the personal family circumstances. Whilst I have great sympathy with the particular needs of the family, I have found in the wider public interest. I have been referred to examples of other developments in the vicinity, none of which is directly comparable to the proposal before me, which I have determined on its individual merits.
-

6. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to policy in the National Planning Policy Framework; Policies CSTP 22 and PMD2 in the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015); and Annexe 1.1 in the Thurrock Borough Local Plan (1997), particularly where they seek to promote high quality design and where such design respects the distinct positive characteristics of an area and promotes continuity of street frontages.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR