



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: 9 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3231174

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 19/00521/HHA, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is single-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission granted for a single-storey front extension at 181 Crammavill Street, Stifford Clays, Grays RM16 2AG in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 19/00521/HHA dated 3 April 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: C145-01 Revision D, C145-02 Revision D, C145-03 Revision D, C145-04 Revision D, C145-05 Revision D, C145-06 Revision D.

Procedural Matter

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3231155) on the same site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a dwellinghouse at the end of a row of 5 terraced houses, all of similar general appearance. It is located in a residential area, with the local character typified by rows of terraced houses. The appeal property occupies a corner plot at the junction with Grantham Way.
5. Of the 5 houses in this terraced row, 2 have enclosed porches to their front doors, while 3, including the appeal site, have projecting canopies. Within the

immediate area there is a wide variety of porches and front extensions, including 2 houses which have extensions across the full width of their front elevations.

6. The proposed extension would be about half the width of the front elevation. Although it would be larger than any other front extension within this terrace, it would not be particularly large within the context of the immediate area. It would be a subordinate addition to the property, and of sufficiently shallow depth so that it would not appear unduly prominent within the terrace or wider street scene. While it would be deeper than the other enclosed porches within the terrace, the evidence before me shows that it would be no deeper than the front extensions to other properties on the same side of the street.
7. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and wider area. The proposal therefore accords with the requirements of policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the adopted Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) January 2015, the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (July 2017), and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. The conditions set out above relate to the commencement of development and confirmation of the approved plans. As matching external materials are specified on the approved plans, a separate condition securing this is not necessary.

Conclusion

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

M Chalk

INSPECTOR