



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2022

By Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3285110

56 Edmund Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6HA

- 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 Paul Haggis against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00705/HHA, dated 27 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including two pitched-roof dormers to front elevation and one dormer to rear elevation and extension of single garage to double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion including two pitched-roof dormers to front elevation and one dormer to rear elevation and extension of single garage to double garage at 56 Edmund Road, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6HA in accordance with the terms of the application, 21/00705/HHA, dated 27 April 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing buildings.
 - 3) The first floor bathroom window in the side elevation shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the description of the development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes the development and has been used by the appellant in their submission.

Reason

4. The appeal property is a two storey gable ended detached house of a traditional design. Sitting on a relatively small plot, it is located in an area of similar detached properties, which form part of a relatively recently constructed planned estate.
5. The proposed front dormer windows would be traditionally formed and pitched-roofed in design, centring and aligning on the ground and first floor windows. The proposed front dormers would be narrower than these windows and set back in excess of 0.5m from the front edge of the roof. Although slightly wider than the maximum width given in the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the SPD). The design guidance given in the SPD is advice that should be considered along with the individual circumstances. In this case, although wider than set out in the SPD, the front dormers would appear as recessive, proportionate and in balance with the scale and traditional design of the appeal property.
6. The appeal property sits on the outside of a sweeping bend in the street, it is, therefore, prominently positioned and particularly visible in the streetscape. However, it presents a rather plain architectural design in this context, very much in keeping with its less prominently located neighbours. In particular, its roof currently fails to make apposite contribution to the streetscape. In this regard the proposed front dormers would be reflective of front dormer windows on similar properties in the wider area and add interest to the appeal property, thereby enlivening the streetscape.
7. Although the rear roof slope of the appeal property is not visible from the street onto which it faces, it is partly visible from the adjacent close, which appears from my site visit to be the only place it would be visible from the public realm. From this location it would however be viewed in the context of other rear roof slopes of neighbouring houses and existing rear dormer extensions.
8. The proposed rear dormer extension would be set back in excess of 0.5 metres and what appears to be in excess of 1m from the verge of the roof at the gable ends. Similar to the proposed front dormers, it would align with the ridge of the existing roof.
9. Given the location of the detached property on the bend in the street and the distances to the neighbouring properties on either side and despite the setting back of the proposed rear dormer from the roof verge, the side cheeks of the proposed rear dormer would be partly visible in oblique views from the street.
10. Although it would cover a greater proportion of the roof given as a maximum in the SPD, the proposed rear dormer extension would be proportionate to the scale of this small, detached house. As a result of the degree of its proposed set back from the rear roof edge and verges, it would appear as a recessive and subservient addition to the appeal property. When viewed in the context of the surrounding roofs, where front and rear roof slopes are viewed together, it would appear to be in keeping with its existing context and local streetscene.
11. I find that, in combination, the proposed front and rear dormers would balance the appearance of the property and that the proposal would add interest to the roof of the house, which would result in a slight enhancement to the character

and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area. Further, I find that the proposed garage extension would not result in any harm in this regard.

12. For these reasons the proposal would, therefore, accord with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development demonstrates high quality design and responds to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to proposed conditions suggested by the council in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included the standard required condition relating to the timing of implementation, and to ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the appearance of the existing house, I have included a condition relating to the matching of materials. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to the glazing at first floor level.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR