
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/17/3173272

1 Anne Heart Close, Chafford Hundred, Grays, Essex RM16 6EB

- 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 Richard Martyres against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01731/HHA was refused by notice dated 13 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a pitched rear dormer and velux windows to the front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a primarily residential area comprising modern dwellings, which are predominately terraces and detached dwellings. Apart from a rear dormer to the rear of 43 Lancaster Road, an overriding characteristic of the immediate vicinity of the appeal site is the absence of rear dormers.
 4. Annex A1.1 in the Thurrock Borough Local Plan (1997) states: *Dormer windows, particularly on front and exposed elevations, should not occupy more than 25% of the total area of the roof slope within which they are constructed.*
 5. The proposal includes a rear pitched roof dormer, the scale of which would be contrary to Annex A1.1. In addition I consider that the proposal would unacceptably dominate the rear roof slope. It would dominate the rear roof elevation of this end of terrace property and unbalance the roof profile of the terrace. As the dominant roof in the terrace is the higher roof of the middle property, it would unacceptably compete with the dominance of that roof in the terrace, exacerbating the unbalanced form of development.
 6. The proposed dormer would be visible to occupiers of residential properties in the rear garden environment and visible in part from Anne Heart Close and Lancaster Road. Due to the scale, position and design of the proposal, I
-

consider that it would overwhelm the existing roof, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing host dwelling, disrupting the rear roof profile of this terrace of dwellings. As it would be highly visible in the local vicinity where rear dormers of such a scale are not an overriding characteristic, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to Annex A1.1 in the Local Plan and Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 in the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2011), where they seek for new development to contribute positively to the character of an area, and seek high quality design.
8. I consider the policies referred to above are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area and should be seeking to ensure high quality design.
9. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised including the presence of the large rear dormer at 43 Lancaster Road and examples of other dormers in the wider area. In particular, I consider that the rear dormer at 43 Lancaster Road appears as a discordant addition. I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits and particularly within the context of its position in the streetscene. The presence of harmful development elsewhere is not necessarily a good reason to allow similar development. For the reasons stated above, I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR