
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3228880

183 Abbotts Drive, Stanford-Le-Hope, Essex SS17 7BN

- 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 Sophie O'Donohue against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01693/HHA was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single-storey front extension. Second-storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the single-storey front extension. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the second-storey rear extension. Planning permission is granted for a second-storey rear extension at 183 Abbotts Drive, Stanford-Le-Hope, Essex SS17 7BN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 18/01693/HHA dated 21 November 2018 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 001H, 002H, 003H and 004H in so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two-storey dwelling, situated in a group of dwellings of similar scale and design. A distinct feature of this group is the side gaps between dwellings, where garages are set to the rear retaining

predominately open areas between the two-storey properties. The retained gaps create a sense of openness. I consider these gaps make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the properties and surrounding area.

4. Whilst the description of the development refers to a proposed single-storey front extension, the plans show that this would be a single-storey side extension with the front façade aligning with the existing main frontage. It would be situated almost up to the side boundary. Thus, the existing gap at ground floor level would be substantially lost.
5. From my observations, due to the siting and scale of the proposed side extension, I consider that it would appear as an incongruous addition, not in keeping with the uniformity of design and pattern of development in this area. The sense of openness between properties would be unacceptably eroded. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposed side extension would be contrary to Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 in the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015), where they seek to ensure high quality design that respects the distinct positive characteristics of an area. I consider these policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, where it seeks to ensure good design and for new development to be sympathetic to local character.
6. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised. In particular, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.
7. I note the family circumstances, including the need for privacy and the need for other family members to live at the property to help with care. At my site visit I was able to see the existing arrangements for myself. It is clear that the proposed floorplan would provide the needs required and that the existing open plan layout and restricted door openings do not. However, the existing dwelling has a significant ground floor area and the current unsatisfactory living arrangements are predominately exacerbated by the open plan arrangement. I do not consider the proposed side extension to be the only way to satisfy the requirements, which could be met by a reconfiguration of the existing ground floor layout. Thus, I do not consider the proposed side extension to be essential and it does not follow from the PSED that the appeal should succeed.

Second Storey Rear Extension

8. Whilst the description of the development refers to a proposed second-storey side and rear extension, the plans clearly show that this would be a second-storey extension to the rear over part of the existing single-storey rear projection. It would not extend to the side of the property. Thus, I have determined the appeal on this basis.
9. The Council has not raised concern regarding the proposed second-storey rear extension. The roof of the proposed second-storey rear extension would be set down from the main ridgeline and the proposed fenestration would be in keeping with the existing fenestration. This would be in keeping with the

character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area. In addition, due to its siting, bulk and design, I consider that this proposal would not have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours. The proposal would be in accordance with Core Strategy Policies PMD2 and CSTP22.

10. As the proposed second-storey rear extension would be clearly severable from the proposed single-storey side extension, I consider it appropriate to issue a split decision in this respect.
11. The Council has suggested the imposition of standard materials and plans conditions. I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose such conditions together with a standard commencement condition.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR