



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MArborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3246418

25 Whitmore Avenue, Stifford Clays, Grays RM16 2JA

- 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 Mrs Trudy Mayes against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01648/HHA, dated 1 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Procedural Matter

3. The plan numbers listed on the Council's decision notice do not fully correlate with those shown on the plans before me. Nevertheless, the Council has confirmed that the plans I have been provided with are those on which it based its decision and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey mid-terraced dwelling located within a moderately dense residential area. It currently has a small flat roofed storm porch over the two front doors matching other dwellings within the same terrace. The row of terraced dwellings share a consistent building line and this, along with the similar appearance of individual properties within the terrace affords it a strong uniform character, which the appeal property contributes positively to. The proposal is for a single storey extension to the front of the appeal property, including an enlarged entrance hallway and a water closet (WC).

6. The proposal would be visible within the streetscene, due to its positioning on the front elevation of the appeal property. It would be the only front extension present on the row of terraces in which it is located and would sit forward of the building line of the row of terraces by around 1.2 metres. This would noticeably break the existing and characteristic building line of this row of terraced dwellings and would appear as a prominent addition to the appeal property and terrace as a whole. On this basis, the proposal would appear out of keeping with the character and appearance of this row of terraces and would give rise to marked harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Thurrock Design Guide Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) indicates that front extensions larger than porches will generally only be acceptable where the front garden is unusually deep and the extension does not break clear of existing building lines along the street. The description of the proposal is a single storey front extension and as it also includes a WC, it could not be classified solely as a porch. Whilst the SPD makes some allowance for front extensions in deep front gardens, this is not the case for this appeal property. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, the proposal would step forward of the existing building line along this part of the street. Therefore, it would not be deemed acceptable under the guidance in this SPD.
8. A similar development for a front extension at 8 Whitmore Avenue has been brought to my attention. However, the plans provided by the appellant show that No 8 is an end of terrace dwelling and has an existing porch and full width canopy to the front of it. Photos of other similar development within the area have also been provided by the appellant. Nonetheless, these are not within the same row of terraces as the appeal property and the full details surrounding their approval have not been provided. Therefore, these examples do not share the same context as the appeal property and they do not justify a planning permission in this instance.
9. I therefore consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would thus conflict with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Council Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015. These policies require, amongst other things, development to contribute positively to the character of the area and to demonstrate high quality design. As highlighted above, the proposal would also conflict with the guidance of the SPD.

Conclusions and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Alex Hutson INSPECTOR