

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2020

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3249606

14 Manor Road, Stanford Le Hope SS17 0NY

- 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 Alan Law against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01685/HHA, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is part two-storey, part single-storey side extension on both sides; part two-storey, part single-storey rear extension; loft conversion; rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential cul-de-sac of mixed property types, including detached and semi-detached dwellings, and bungalows and chalet bungalows.
 4. Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development document (the Core Strategy) require development to respond to and respect the character of the area, and to provide a high quality of design. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.
 5. The *Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides detailed guidance in support of development plan policies. It says that alterations should respect and respond positively to the character of the original dwelling so as to maintain or enhance its character.
 6. No 14 is a modestly-sized dwelling, which retains a good degree of separation from the neighbouring properties to either side. Despite the varied property types within the street scene, there is some visual uniformity between Nos 14
-

and 16; the two dwellings are of similar design and proportions with the same roof profile and bay windows to the front.

7. The principal change to the front would involve upper floor side extensions above the existing single storey elements to either side, set back from the original frontage. This would include a large roof with the same forward pitch as the original front roof slope, an element of flat roof and barn hips to either side.
8. These side additions and particularly the extent of the new roof would materially alter the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would add considerable bulk to the roof profile and while the extensions would be set back, the main extent of new roof would be the same height as the roof ridge of the existing dwelling.
9. The SPD says that extensions should be subservient to the original dwelling, which would include making the addition smaller and lower than the existing house. This would not be the case with the extended roof and I agree with the Council's assessment in this regard that the extensions would effectively create a secondary built form behind the original dwelling. This would result in an incongruous and disjointed visual relationship between the original and extended dwelling, which would be harmful in its own right and by contrast to No 16, given that this neighbouring dwelling would retain its similar, original form. In particular, the bulk, height and extent of the new built form would dominate rather than be subservient to that of the original dwelling.
10. Despite the additional width created up to the boundary with No 16, a sufficient gap would be maintained due to No 16's single storey garage between the properties. On the other side, the extension would infill the existing gap over the single storey element next to No 12, a bungalow of much smaller size. The loss of this existing gap at upper floor level combined with the bulk created would result in the extended dwelling having an overbearing and dominant visual relationship to No 12. There are no similar examples of this type of relationship between neighbouring dwellings within the existing street scene. As such, it would represent an uncharacteristic and incongruous change.
11. To the rear, the overall effects of the much bulkier property would be apparent by contrast to the scale of the neighbouring dwellings. The dormers would not in themselves be harmful, particularly as there are examples of larger similar features on nearby dwellings. The single storey rear extension would be a proportionate addition that would be appropriate in terms of design and appearance.
12. Nonetheless, taking these findings as a whole and for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently, it is contrary to Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Core Strategy, as described above.

Other Matters

13. I have had regard to the representation made by an interested party. This does not, however, raise any additional matters in relation to the main issue in this appeal that would lead me to reach a different overall conclusion.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR