
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2017

by Alex Hutson MATP CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 17 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/17/3175745

9 Palmerston Road, South Stifford, Grays RM20 4YH

- 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 Mrs E Nicholls against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00061/HA, dated 17 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The description of the proposed development on the application form refers to the construction of a two storey side extension. However, the submitted plans show that a single storey extension to the rear of the appeal property and to the rear of the two storey side extension is also proposed. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, hipped roofed, end of terrace dwelling with a single storey detached garage. The wider area is predominantly residential in character. Whilst the dwellings within the terraced block are of no particular architectural merit, they are of a similar width. This provides a level of uniformity to the terraced block. In addition, the setback of the appeal property from the shared boundary with 7 Palmerston Road, a two storey semi-detached dwelling also set away from this boundary, provides a sense of space and openness along this part of the road. These factors contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would demolish the single storey garage and a rear conservatory and would erect a two storey side extension with a single storey extension to the rear of the appeal property and to the rear of the two storey side extension. The proposed two storey side extension would be approximately

- the same width as the appeal property and would extend almost to the shared boundary with No 7.
6. I acknowledge that the intention is to take advantage of the more spacious plot width. I also recognise that the two storey side extension would be of the same height and depth as the appeal property, would incorporate a hipped roof and would be constructed from matching materials.
 7. Nevertheless, it would increase considerably the overall bulk and scale of the appeal property. This would appear at considerable odds with the bulk and scale of other dwellings within the terraced block and other dwellings along the road in general. It would also erode to a substantial degree the sense of space and openness along this part of the road. Consequently, it would represent a dominant and incongruous form of development which would give rise to significant harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and area.
 8. The appellant makes reference to other dwellings along Palmerston Road which have been extended. However, no specific properties or examples have been identified. However, I observed during my site visit that No 10, on the opposite side of the road, appears to have a two storey side extension. Nonetheless, the apparent extension is less wide than its host dwelling and is set back at first floor level. This maintains a proportionate and subordinate relationship with its host dwelling, whereas the proposal under consideration in this appeal would not.
 9. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development Focused Review 2015 (Core Strategy). This policy requires, amongst other things, development to contribute positively to the character of the area.
 10. The Council also cites conflict with Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy. However, this policy does not relate to character and appearance and is therefore not relevant to this appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters, including sewers, parking pressure, highway safety, damage to foundations, noise and disturbance and dust, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex Hutson

INSPECTOR