



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/23/3319139

15 Norfolk Place, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6DE

- 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 Carlton Walters against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01497/HHA, dated 7 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of two existing dormers with a rear dormer loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey detached house with a single-storey rear addition and a garage to the side. It includes accommodation within the roof space which gains natural light via pairs of small dormers within the front and rear roof slopes. The house is situated on a corner and therefore the rear roof slope is highly visible in views looking along the Norfolk Place, as is the rear of the house on the opposite side of Norfolk place, which essentially mirrors the roof form of the appeal property.
4. The property is situated in a residential estate containing houses of similar age and appearance with pitched roofs containing small dormers. These dormers are therefore a prevailing characteristic of the area and positively contribute to the area's relatively unified appearance.
5. The proposal would comprise the replacement of the pair of dormers in the rear roof slope with an almost full-width dormer, incorporating a part hipped and part flat roof. Due to its elevated and exposed position this addition would be a wholly alien and incongruous element in the street scene and would be out of keeping with the prevailing roof forms in the area and the appearance of the appeal property.

6. Due to its siting, size and design I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host property and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development Document (2015) which require development to respond to and respect the character of the area, and to provide a high quality of design. There is also conflict with the *Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions* Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) aims to ensure that the form and scale of extensions is appropriate to the original dwelling and the surrounding development pattern.
7. The appellant has referred to roof additions in Felipe Road, about a 10-minute walk from the appeal property. These rather awkward additions are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme as they comprise pairs of dormers with boxy links between them. In addition, the planning permissions for these additions pre-date the current development plan and the SPD. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular context and current planning policy I attribute limited weight to the roof additions in Felipe Road.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR