The Planning Inspectorate

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/20/3256172
26 Whitmore Avenue, Stifford Clays, Essex RM16 2HX

- 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 Ms N Richards against the decision of Thurrock Council.
- The application Ref 20/00168/HHA, dated 30 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2020.
- The development proposed is single storey front extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-of-terrace two storey dwelling in a residential estate of similarly laid out terraces.

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 front extensions and porches should complement the character of the street, including any existing pattern of front extensions, and respect existing building lines, particularly where a strongly defined building line forms an important characteristic of the street. Front extensions that are 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. In areas where there is an irregular building line and

properties are well set back with large front gardens, front extensions may be more acceptable[1].

6. The properties in the terrace of which No 26 is a part, as well as those in the immediately surrounding area, are largely unaltered. Where alterations to the front have taken place, these are typically in the form of porches with mono-pitched roofs that extend across no more than half the width of the dwelling's frontage.

7. The proposed extension in this case would be of similar built form to these porches, in terms of depth and roof profile, but would extend across the dwelling's full width. As such, it would introduce a wholly new design feature into the street scene, which would be uncharacteristic of the unaltered dwellings and those with more limited front extensions, and which would more significantly break the existing building line.

8. Despite the relatively long front garden compared to other dwellings, the open aspect to the front and wider visibility would make the change prominent in views from neighbouring properties and the public realm. From these views, the front extension's contrast with the predominant form of development and incongruous appearance would be readily apparent, despite the use of matching materials. The fact that the appeal property is an end-of-terrace dwelling does not alter these findings.

9. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed extension 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 and to the SPD, as described above.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is intended to create additional living space. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the harm and conflict with development plan policies that I have found would result from the proposal.

11. I acknowledge also that the appellant may be frustrated with the process involved in pursuing this proposal. However, this matter is outside the scope of this appeal.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR

[1] Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.