



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2020

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3256524

1 Clover Court, Grays RM17 6TR

- 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 Romail Paramythas against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00499/HHA, dated 27 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is single storey side/rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of 1 Clover Court (No 1) and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The development would involve the erection of a single storey, flat roofed, side and rear extension. No 1 is a two storey, detached house that occupies what is in effect a corner position at the junction of Clover Court, a cul-de-sac of two dwellings, and the south western end of Churchill Road.
4. No 1 is of a quite simple design, having a rectangular floorplan with a fully hipped pitched roof, and a discretely located single garage between the house and 2 Clover Court. The proposed extension would wrap around one of No 1's side elevations and its rear elevation and this addition would more or less double the ground floor footprint of this house and it would project above the boundary fence that encloses part of the side garden and the whole of the rear garden. Taking the size and location of the proposed extension together with its flat roof design, I consider that this development would be excessive in scale and would not be respectful of No 1's appearance.
5. I also consider that the reliance on such an expanse of flat roofing would result in an addition that would have a box like appearance that would not be innovative and would represent a poor design that would not be in sympathy with No 1's appearance. While the walls of the extension would be constructed with brickwork to match No 1, I consider that aspect of the development's design would not address its poor appearance.

6. The side extension would virtually occupy all of the space between No 1's existing flank wall and the back edge of the pavement in Churchill Road. That siting would be at odds with the setting back of the front or side elevations of dwellings that characterises the pattern of development in Churchill Road and the other streets leading off it. Given the extension's siting and having regard to its height and flat roof form, I consider this addition would be readily apparent within Churchill Road and would appear as an obvious addition to No 1 that would be disrespectful of the local streetscene. While No 1 is located at one end of Churchill Road, it is a property that nevertheless can be seen readily within the public domain, given the proximity of the recreational space on the other side of the street and the turning head to the rear of No 1.
7. Attention has been drawn to the single storey side extension at 20 Comfrey Court (No 20), a larger cul-de-sac of houses leading off Churchill Road. While the side extension at No 20 runs the full depth of this house, it is not comparable with the side extension proposed for No 1. That is because the side elevation of No 20's extension is inset from that dwelling's boundary with Churchill Road by a few metres, while this addition has a pitched roof. Those design elements of the extension at No 20 collectively reduce the visual impact of this addition, notwithstanding its prominent location within the streetscene. Reference has also been made to some rear extensions at properties within Coltsfoot Court, another nearby cul-de-sac. However, I consider the circumstances of those extensions are not comparable with the proposal for No 1 because they are rear additions that are not readily apparent within the streetscene.
8. While the proposed development would provide additional accommodation for the occupiers of No 1, I consider that would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of No 1 and the surrounding area. I therefore consider that the development would be contrary to Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development of 2011 and the Council's Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document of 2017. That is because the development would neither promote a high quality of design nor contribute positively to the character of the area within which it would be located.
10. Having concluded that the proposed development would be of a poor quality, I consider that it finds no support from the provisions of section 12 'Achieving well-designed places' of the National Planning Policy Framework of 2019, which, amongst other things, requires new development to be of a good design and advises that permission should be refused for development of a poor design. I therefore consider that the proposed extension would not amount to sustainable development.

Conclusion

11. I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR