



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2019

by Christopher Miell MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3233460

75 Mayflower Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6BE

- 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 Gary Grout against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00794/HHA, dated 23 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling situated on a corner plot at the junction of Mayflower Road and Norfolk Place. The surrounding area has an urban character with a mix of residential property types present within the street and a large school campus opposite the appeal site.
4. The residential properties are typically two-storey in scale and have gable roof forms. A high proportion of the properties within the immediate area feature dormer windows. Where dormer windows are present, the overall mass and window proportions of the dormer windows are well related to the host building. Consequently, the properties appear well balanced when viewed from the street, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. It is proposed to erect a dormer window on the front elevation and two dormer windows on the rear elevation to facilitate a loft conversion at the appeal property. The dormer windows would have a gable roof form.
6. Despite the use of a sympathetic gable roof form, the height, width, overall mass and the window proportions of the proposed dormer windows would not relate to the host building, which has a limited roof space and modest window openings at the ground and first floor. Consequently, the proposed dormer windows would appear excessively large, when viewed against the context of the existing building, which would unacceptably diminish the architectural integrity of the property.

7. In addition, and for the reasons above, when viewed in the context of the surrounding area, the proposed dormer windows would appear as an unduly prominent form of development, which would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant contends that the proposed dormer windows would comply with guidelines for roof slopes when calculating the height and width of the dormers in relation to the overall height and width of the host building. However, I have been provided with no information in relation to the source of these guidelines and whether or not they form part of the development plan. As such, I have afforded this matter limited weight in the overall planning balance.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal does not accord with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended 2015), which, amongst other things, require high quality design that contributes positively to the character of the area.
10. In addition, the proposal does not accord with the advice contained within the Thurrock Design Guide: Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which, amongst other things, states '*Roof conversions and additions will only be acceptable where high quality design is employed, where additions are in scale with the existing roof, and where the addition does not spoil the existing roof form.*'

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Christopher Miell

INSPECTOR