



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2025

by **P H Wallace BSc (Hons) DipMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/25/3370899

21 Cecil Avenue, Chafford Hundred, Thurrock, Grays RM16 6QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Gintare Remeikiene against the decision of the Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00560/HHA
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The development was originally described by the appellant as a dormer extension. Subsequent submissions, including the Council's description and the appellant's appeal form, referred to a rear extension. As the plans before me relate solely to the dormer and the parties have agreed the scope, the settled description is as set out in the banner heading.
3. The planning application was submitted retrospectively. At the time of my site visit, the dormer envelope depicted in the submitted drawings was in place, comprising profiled zinc cladding to the cheeks and fascia. Three fascia openings were present and boarded, with the outer two openings extending to full height.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a detached, two-storey house set within a cul-de-sac of similarly designed detached and semi-detached red-brick houses under variegated red-brown tiled roofs. The cul-de-sac presents a generally uniform appearance reinforced by the absence of dormers and other later roof additions. A recurring feature, evident on some houses including the appeal dwelling, is a mock-Tudor timber-beam motif set within cream render at first-floor gable level; this theme punctuates the close and provides a pleasant counterpoint to the prevailing brick and tile materials.
6. The appeal property occupies a prominent corner plot, with its flank and front elevations facing the cul-de-sac. The rear garden abuts the roadside to the north and is enclosed by a high brick wall, fronted by a row of deciduous trees. From the

south, at the end of the close, the property is partly screened by the modest setback of the neighbouring dwelling (No. 20) beyond the rear wall of the appeal property.

7. The development has introduced a large box dormer to the rear roofslope which, although set back slightly from the eaves, spans the width of the house and projects forward to align with the rear wall. Its forward extent rises marginally above the main ridge and is capped by a shallow pitched roof that integrates with the existing apex. Three openings have been inserted in the dormer face; the proposed plans show these finished to align with and broadly match the dimensions of the first-floor rear windows. The dormer is to be finished in a mock-Tudor half-board treatment, reflecting the gable feature on the front elevation and similar detailing elsewhere in the close.
8. While the tree cover to the side boundary would be capable of filtering views of the dormer from within the cul-de-sac to the north and north-west when in leaf, at the time of my visit leaf cover was mostly absent, enabling the dormer to be clearly seen within the street context. By virtue of its size, occupying almost the whole of the roof plane with only minimal margins to the sides and eaves, the dormer obscures the legibility of the original pitched roof form. As a result, it dominates the elevation as an excessively bulky and visually assertive addition, appearing markedly out of keeping with the host property's original proportions, thereby harming its character and appearance.
9. The proposal's conspicuous scale and massing conflict with the generally uniform and traditionally pitched roofscape within the close. The visual interruption created by the dormer breaks the established rhythm, balance and consistency of the group, drawing undue attention to the appeal property and eroding the coherent character derived from their similar roof forms to the detriment of the appearance of the area.
10. The mock-Tudor half-board effect, involving the use of a lighter coloured render, would likely increase the prominence of the structure and introduce an incongruity, given that this detailing elsewhere in the Close is expressed at gable level rather than as an elevated roof addition. While the appellant has indicated a willingness to consider changes to the external finish of the development if required this would not address the fundamental concern, which arises from the overall dimensions of the dormer.
11. Reference has been made to the fact that the proposal would make good use of the available site by providing additional and improved living accommodation for the occupiers and that the scheme has delivered some improvements to the property's thermal performance. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm I have identified. There is also no compelling evidence that these benefits are entirely dependent on the scale and form of development proposed; accordingly, they do not justify the harm found.
12. For the reasons given, the proposed development harms the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) (2015) and the adopted Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions (RAE) Design Guide SPD 2017 which, amongst other

things, seek developments that respect local character and provide contextually appropriate design.

Other Matters

13. I have also been referred to other sites locally where dormers have been granted planning permission by the Council. I note the comparisons made with the appeal proposal and the response provided by the Council. I conclude that the circumstances relating to those cases are materially different from the proposal before me. In any event, this appeal has been assessed on its individual merits and with reference to its specific context.
14. I acknowledge that the development would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbours and that the car parking demand arising from the proposal would not be unacceptable.
15. It is regrettable that the appellant was unaware that permitted development rights had been removed from the property. I note the assertion that details of the original permission confirming the removal of those rights were not accessible via the Council's website. However, the Council's submission indicates that the restriction was validly imposed and, in the absence of cogent evidence of a legal or procedural defect, the appellant's lack of awareness does not render the development lawful and cannot therefore carry weight in the planning balance.

Conclusion

16. As it would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, I conclude the proposal would not comply with the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

PH Wallace

INSPECTOR