



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 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/19/3239479

12 San Marcos Drive, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6LT

- 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 Mirwais Haidari against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01190/HHA, dated 1 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a “wood garage built at the side of house”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a detached dwelling that is located within an established residential estate. Although there is a variety in the style and size of properties that are constructed using varying materials, such as red and yellow brick and render, there remains a degree of uniformity to the area that is created by the layout of dwellings being set back from the road. Properties tend to benefit from garaging that is also set back from the front elevation of the property they serve to allow additional parking in front of the garage. Some of the existing garaging, including the appeal site and its neighbour at No. 10, have been converted into living accommodation.
4. The garage has been erected at the site which I was able to view during my visit and is constructed of horizontal timber boarding that has been stained or painted black. The building has a flat roof and is set forward of the existing brick garage and sits proud of the main dwelling. The appellant describes the development as minor, innovative and contemporary.
5. Examples of materials throughout the estate have been provided by the appellant, some of which contain timber as stanchions for car ports. While I accept that there is a range of materials in the vicinity, the development fails to take cues from these and, along with its flat roof and positioning, the garage is an awkward and somewhat discordant form of development that is in stark contrast to the established character of the area. The forward projection of the

development also adds to its prominence within the street scene, especially when viewed from the junction of San Juan Drive and San Marcos Drive.

6. Thus, the development results in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It is in conflict with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2011 (as amended in 2015) and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments contribute positively to the character of an area and respect the distinct positive characteristics and create a sense of place within their schemes.

Other Matters

7. The appellant refers to the adjoining garage and its finish in a different brick colour to the main dwelling as an example of differing materials in the area. Nevertheless, the garage at No. 10 is constructed of brick and is a material that is complementary to the area and does not have the same impact on the street scene as the garage at the appeal site.
8. I note that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states at paragraph 126 that the level of detail should be tailored to the circumstances in each place, allowing a degree of variety where this would be justified. However, the Framework also states at paragraph 130 that developments that fail to take opportunities for improving the character of an area, should be refused.
9. I acknowledge that the appellant seeks to retain the development so that there is a safe and secure area to park his car. However, whilst noting the benefits that would result in this respect, these are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wyatt

INSPECTOR