
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2024

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/24/3343428

76 Camden Road, Chafford Hundred, Thurrock RM16 6PY

- 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 Stephen Prosser against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application reference is 23/01297/HHA.
 - The proposed development is to re-roof the dwelling in mansard style by increasing ridge height to provide second floor rooms with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal decision is the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey, detached property in a modern residential neighbourhood. To the front on the other side of a communal driveway is an area of amenity land with a footpath that permeates the local estate.
4. At my site visit I saw that nearly all dwellings in the vicinity have simple, blank pitched roofs with gable ends that gives a sense of uniformity to the area. Whilst the increase in height would be minimal, the appeal proposal to create a bulkier and more dominant gambrel roof form, together with a substantial, prominent front skylight would therefore appear at odds with this predominant architectural style, to the detriment of the host property and the wider street scene.
5. The new dormer window would be relatively large, with a flat roof and a wide expanse of glazing. As there are no other dormer elements evident in the local area, in my view care needs to be taken introducing such features into this part of the estate.
6. With this in mind, I consider that the overall size, proximity to the ridge line and centralised positioning of the scheme within the roof slope would appear dominant and be harmful to the character of the dwelling and locality. Moreover, the misalignment of the fenestration with the openings below, and the relatively large expanse of glazing at roof level that would be significantly larger than other windows elsewhere on the house, would result in a discordant and top-heavy appearance.

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a gambrel roof at 11 Bark Burr Road. However, this is situated a considerable distance from the appeal site in a street scene of more varied forms, including houses with square hip roofs and a large primary school complex; it is not therefore comparable to the scheme before me.
8. I appreciate that the appeal site is neither located within a Conservation Area nor is it a listed building or heritage asset, and the proposal would be constructed using complementary materials. It would also allow the property to be extended in order to increase residential living space for the occupants without compromising on the amenity space of the dwelling or impacting negatively upon the amenity of neighbouring residents. Nevertheless, these factors would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the 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, and the Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Together these require schemes 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. It would also be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conclusion

10. In respect of the foregoing and all other factors, the appeal is dismissed.

C Hall

INSPECTOR