



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Graham Wyatt BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/19/3237430

20 Furness Close, Chadwell St Mary, Essex RM16 4JB

- 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 Maciez Czarnecki against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00701/HHA, dated 1 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 20 Furness Close, Chadwell St Mary, Essex RM16 4JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/00701/HHA, dated 1 May 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Details 3896/1 and Proposed Details 3896/3.

Preliminary Matter

2. The postcode on the application form states RM16 4LL as the address for the appeal site. However, both the Council's delegated report and the appeal form refer to the postcode as RM16 4JB, which I have used as it more accurately reflects the address of the appeal site.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site forms a mid-terrace dwelling that is located within an estate of similar properties. The terrace is staggered so that the adjoining property at 18 Furness Close is set forward of the front elevation of the appeal site. The proposal seeks to erect a single storey front extension to create an enlarged kitchen area.
5. Although the terrace that the appeal site forms part of does not contain a front extension similar to that proposed, there are numerous examples of front

extensions in the area. Therefore, any coherent style or type of development in the vicinity has been eroded through the differing extensions that currently exist in the area. Some of the properties also contain bay windows, examples of which are visible within the terrace that the appeal site sits within. Consequently, I do not consider that the appeal site forms part of a strongly defined building line that is an important characteristic of the street.

6. Moreover, given that the appeal site sits back from the adjoining property, the extension would not have the same visible projection into the street scene in comparison to other properties in the vicinity, for example the front extensions at 6 and 8 Furness Close or those opposite at 19 and 21 Furness Close.
7. Thus, the development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. It would not be in conflict with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Borough Council Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2011 and the Thurrock Borough Council Design Guide Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017 which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments promote continuity of street frontages and make a positive response to local context.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time condition, it is necessary in the interest of certainty to define the plans of which the scheme shall accord. As the proposed plans detail that the external materials of the proposal shall match the existing building, there is no requirement for an additional condition regarding materials.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to the development plan when read as a whole, the appeal is allowed.

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR