



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 August 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3231155

181 Crammavill Street, Stifford Clays, Grays RM16 2AG

- 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 & Mrs Stuart & Nicola Richardson against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00518/HHA, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

1. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3231174) on the same site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwellinghouse in a residential street at the junction of Crammavill Street and Grantham Way.
4. The side elevation of the house is set significantly away from the site boundary. During my site visit I saw that this spacing is mirrored at 183 Crammavill Street, and to the sides of 186 and 188 Crammavill Street.
5. Crammavill Street is therefore characterised by a generally spacious layout, with wide pavements that provide space for off-street parking. All the houses in the immediate area of the appeal site have gardens so that none sit directly adjacent to the highway.
6. The proposed side extension would significantly reduce the space to the side of the appeal property. While a gap would be retained, it would not be sufficient to overcome the harm that would arise from the proposed development to the overall spacious character of the area. The siting of the proposed extension would interrupt the established appearance emphasised by a consistent line of built development along Grantham Way set by the appeal property and the

properties on Hogarth Road to its rear. This would result in an unduly prominent appearance for the appeal property within the street scene. The effect would be amplified by the lack of visual interest in the blank side elevation of the extension.

7. In reaching the above findings, I have had regard to other two-storey side extensions in the area that have been brought to my attention by the appellants at 198 Crammavill Street, 11 Hogarth Road and 14 Grantham Way. Whilst I have not been provided with any substantive details regarding these proposals, and in relation to 14 Grantham Way no planning permission was given, I viewed each property from the public highway during my site visit. 198 Crammavill Street lies at the junction with Stifford Clays Road, with a larger gap to the side of the property. The extension to 11 Hogarth Road, which appears to be larger than the proposed development, does not break the building line established by the house to its rear. 14 Grantham Way is located at the end of a cul-de-sac, in a much more open location where the extension is less prominent. I do not consider that these other examples are directly comparable to the appeal property due to the differences in location and their relationship to neighbouring properties. In any case, each appeal must be determined on its own merits, which is what I have done.
8. Having regard to all the above considerations, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The development would therefore be contrary to policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) January 2015 and guidance in the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (July 2017). Together these seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design founded on a thorough understanding of the local context and that it contributes positively to the townscape. These policies accord with the design aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore there is no conflict between local and national policy.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss the appeal.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR