
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/24/3340074

42 Kiln Way, Grays, Essex RM17 5JE

- 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 Ismet Limani against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application reference is 23/01428/HHA.
 - The proposed development is for a loft conversion with two front velux windows and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - highway safety and the provision of parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace property in a residential neighbourhood. Other houses are of similar age and design with pitched roofs and an absence of dormer windows. This is a prevailing characteristic of the area and positively contributes to the relatively unified appearance.
4. The proposed dormer window would be relatively large, with a flat roof. It would be in a prominent position, visible from the public highway. As there are no other dormer elements evident in the vicinity, in my view care needs to be taken introducing such features into this part of the estate.
5. With this in mind, I consider that the size of the scheme would appear dominant in the context of the appeal property. Moreover, 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 unbroken roof forms in the locale.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development Document 2015 (CS), and the Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Together these require development to respond to and respect the character of the area, to provide a high quality of design, and ensure the form and scale of extensions is appropriate to the original dwelling and the surrounding development pattern.

Highway safety and parking

7. In the estate parking is provided either off-street on driveways or in communal areas. At my site visit on a Thursday morning I noticed that there are no restrictions on roads within the locality. There was available kerbside parking space on and in the immediate proximity to the site. Whilst I accept this is only a snap shot in time, it is an indication that on street parking is not difficult to achieve at certain times of day.
8. The proposal would create a small 3-bedroom property. It would be unlikely to generate significant levels of traffic requiring on-street parking above and beyond that which already occurs. In the absence of a compelling indication of a local issue I do not consider that the proposal would result in a material shortage in parking provision in this location. Nor has it been demonstrated that even if there was a material deficiency it would be bound to have a harmful effect on highway safety.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not be harmful to highway safety or parking provision, and accordingly there would be no conflict with Policies PMD2 and PMD8 of the CS.

Conclusion

10. Whilst there would be no detrimental impact on highway safety and parking provision, the development would be harmful on character and appearance grounds. The appeal therefore fails.

C Hall

INSPECTOR