



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3249911

31 Edmund Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jay Edmunds against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01688/HHA dated 12 November 2019 was refused by notice dated 8 January 2020.
 - The proposed development is described in the application form as a loft conversion to create two bedrooms including raising of ridge to match other properties nearby that have carried out the same work with the same design.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached dwelling with a forward-facing traditional gable end. The appeal dwelling sits slightly lower than neighbouring property No.29 due to the different ground levels. No.29 shares the forward facing gable design feature at the appeal dwelling and although there are many differences between the two properties, including different ground floor front extensions and different roof forms, this design feature provides a sense of uniformity amidst the various styles of houses in the surrounding vicinity. This positive relationship that No.29 and the appeal dwelling share gives a pleasant visual characteristic when viewed from the street scene. Furthermore, the surrounding varying roof designs appeared to be unaltered and dormers, do not appear to be prevalent in the surrounding area.
5. The proposed development would increase the ridge height to meet the height of the neighbouring dwelling at No.29. This increase in height would not be harmful as it would further strengthen the relationship between the two houses. However, the proposal would change the forward-facing traditionally

shaped gable end to a mansard shaped roof which would unbalance the consistency it shares with No.29, to the detriment of the street scene. Furthermore, the proposal would be at odds with the local vicinity where roof forms of this shape are rare. Also, dormer extensions are not a characteristic feature locally and therefore the two large dormers, particularly that facing the road, would also result in the proposal appearing as a dominant and incongruous form of development when viewed in the street scene.

6. The appellant has provided photos of houses with differing roof forms. However, these sites on Drake Road and Daniel Close, are some distance from the site and so do not influence its context.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework, Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended), adopted January 2015, (Local Plan), which requires development to contribute positively and enhance the character of the area. Conflict is also found with Policy CSTP22 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure developments respect the distinct positive characteristics of the area.
8. The proposal adheres to some parts of The Thurrock Design Guidance, Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, July 2017, (SPD), which states, dormers should be setback from the eaves and should not be more than half the width of the roof slope. However, the Council and appellant agree the dormers would each have a width of 3m. This would not adhere to the SPD which advises widths be limited to 2m. In addition, the roof is not so wide that a dormer of this size would be better suited. As such, despite compliance with aspects of the SPD, the development would still result in harm.

Other Matters

9. Whilst the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, these factors do not outweigh the harm the proposal presents.

Recommendation and Conclusion

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

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR