



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by Mariam Noorgat BSc (Hons)

Decision by Andrew Owen BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3248925

123 Southend Road, Grays RM17 5NP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Jacqueline Ramsey against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01865/HHA dated 23 December 2019 was refused by notice dated 14 February 2020.
 - The proposed development is a first-floor side extension over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling forms the left-hand half of a pair of two storey semi-detached houses and is of traditional design. The semi-detached pair the appeal dwelling is a part of have single storey side extensions which maintains a sense of balance and uniformity. The surrounding dwellings along Southend Road are similarly configured and although there are a few two storey side extensions present, these are not in the majority. As such, the gaps between the dwellings at first floor level, are characteristic of the area and provide a sense of openness.
5. Although there would be a 400mm setback from the front elevation, the proposal would still appear as a significantly sized side extension in comparison to the subservient nature of the existing single storey side extension at the site and those present within the immediate vicinity. This would harmfully disrupt the existing sense of balance and uniformity the appeal dwelling shares with No. 121. The proposal would also reduce the wide gap it shares with No. 125 at first floor level which would diminish the sense of openness and fail to respect the prevailing pattern and character of the immediate vicinity. The 100mm gap, as shown on the plans, that the proposal would retain to the neighbouring

property would not overcome this harm. Further, the proposed guttering that would sit on top of the flank wall would deviate from the traditional design of the appeal dwelling and appear incongruous.

6. The appellant has provided photos of houses with two storey side extensions which appear to be on Tennyson Avenue and Southend Road. However, most of these extensions appear to be set further back from the front elevation than the proposal would be. There are only two examples which are not set back and so this characteristic does not contribute strongly to the character of the area. Indeed, there are no examples in the immediate surroundings of the appeal site.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development therefore conflicts with Policies PMD2 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework, Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended), adopted January 2015, (Local Plan), which requires development to contribute positively and enhance the character of the area. Conflict is also found with Policy CSTP22 of the Local Plan which seeks to ensure developments respect the distinct positive characteristic of the area. The proposal also does not adhere to the Thurrock Design Guidance, Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document, July 2017, which states that two storey extensions should be set back from the side boundary to avoid terracing.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the appellant's agent states they have been involved in the approval of similar developments within the borough, I do not have the planning details of these and therefore cannot give them any consideration.

Recommendation and Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mariam Noorgat

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR