

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3231766

Raglan, Central Avenue, Stanford Le Hope SS17 8HQ

- 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 Jamie Jolliffe against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00283/HHA, dated 21 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is two storey extension to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey extension to side at Raglan, Central Avenue, Stanford Le Hope SS17 8HQ. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 19/00283/HHA, dated 21 February 2019, 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 extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans (all with the prefix KJM10184): 001 H (roof plan), 002 H (floor plans), 003 H (elevations), 004 H (location and site plans) and 005 H (block plan).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a chalet bungalow with accommodation in the roof space, located next to the junction of Central Avenue with Branksome Avenue. This end of Central Avenue includes similar property types to Raglan, which are positioned relatively close together. The appeal property is unusual in this regard as it includes a generous area of side garden between the dwelling and side boundary along Branksome Avenue.
-

4. The proposal involves a relatively modest extension within the side garden that would be set down from the host dwelling's roof, would respect its front building line and would not be built to the full depth of the existing building. As such, it would be a typical domestic extension that would not be of disproportionate scale to the host dwelling or otherwise incongruous. The Council's principal concern in this regard is the loss of the open aspect to the side and the loss of trees to the boundary.
5. Raglan faces a dwelling on the opposite side of the road junction which has its frontage on Branksome Avenue. The open aspect of the front garden to this and neighbouring properties is mirrored to a limited degree by the open aspect to the side of appeal property. However, the different orientation of these dwellings, with their frontages on different roads means that there is little uniformity or other visual relationship between them. The side of Raglan is already positioned forward of the front building line of the properties on Branksome Avenue. Moreover, the fact that the side garden is enclosed by a typical side boundary fence reduces the contribution that this otherwise open area makes to the street scene, both in its own right and by comparison to the front gardens with lower boundary treatments on Branksome Avenue.
6. The proposed extension would not be built up to the boundary but would retain a reasonable gap, which would mean that some planting could be retained or added. Given its more limited height compared to the existing dwelling, the extension would not be seen as incongruous or overbearing from nearby public views. The Council refers to two trees on the site that are covered by a preservation order and which would need to be removed to accommodate the extension (the trees are also shown on the existing site plan). However, at the time of the inspection no such trees existed on the site and, therefore, I must deal with the proposal at it pertains to the circumstances at the time. Furthermore, I am not aware that the Council has required the trees to be replaced.
7. Therefore, taking these findings as a whole, I conclude that the proposed side extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the street scene. Consequently, there is no conflict with Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Core Strategy which require development to respond to and respect the character of the area, and to provide a high quality of design. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. There is also no conflict with The Thurrock Design Guide: Residential Alterations and Extensions.

Conditions

8. Of the Council's suggested conditions I have imposed the standard time condition and, to ensure the proper implementation of development in accordance with the submitted details, one requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans. I agree also that a condition requiring the external materials used to match those of the existing building is needed in the interests of the appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR