



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: 22 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/19/3238315

107 Humber Avenue, South Ockendon RM15 5JT

- 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 Olubiyi (Vision Partners Homes Limited) against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01016/FUL, dated 3 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as the "construction of a dwelling house together with vehicular access, parking and landscaping".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's decision notice refers to paragraph 5.3.2 (b) of the Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017, which relates specifically to two storey side extensions. Thus, I do not consider this document relevant to the development before me.

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 roughly rectangular strip of land that is sited between the side of 107 Humber Drive and Garron Lane. The site is slightly elevated and is bound to the pavement along Garron Lane by a low brick wall. The area is suburban in character, with the site located in an established residential area with the majority of dwellings are pairs of semi-detached properties arranged in a linear manner and set back some distance from the road.
5. There are examples of detached dwellings in the vicinity, with a varying degree of style and size of property, some of which have been altered and extended. Nonetheless, the area has a pleasing sense of rhythm and a degree of uniformity and spaciousness which is reinforced by the similar layout of dwellings.
6. The appeal site is an area of grassland that contributes to the open character of Humber Avenue and Garron Lane, and provides soft landscaping which is reflected in similar side and front garden spaces on corner plots throughout the

area. Although the development would be provided with an adequate private garden space, the proposed dwelling would almost fill the entire width of the narrow plot with only a small gap of some 600mm remaining to the boundary of Garron Lane and 107 Humber Avenue. While I acknowledge that there are examples of dwellings arranged close together, the appeal development would nonetheless see the removal of a parcel of land that contributes towards the openness of the area, interrupting and eroding the uniformity of the street scene. The proposed dwelling would appear cramped within its plot and out of keeping with the prevailing spacious character of the area, when viewed from either Garron Lane or Humber Avenue.

7. Thus, the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be in conflict with Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development 2011 (as amended 2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework (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

8. The appellant refers to 67 Garron Lane being set close to the footway. However, this development is nevertheless set back from the road with a parking area to the front and is seen in the context of development on the east side of Garron Lane. I do not find this particular site to demonstrate similar qualities to the development before me, so as to represent a precedent in favour of the appeal.
9. I acknowledge that the design of the dwelling is acceptable and that suitable materials could be employed. I note that the site lies within a sustainable location that is close to services, amenities and transport links and would boost the supply of housing as required by the Framework. I also accept that there were no objections to the development from neighbouring properties. However, neither this nor any other material consideration that has been advanced outweighs the harm 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