



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 9 February 2021

by A Blicq BSc(Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3261712

194 Southend Road, Stanford le Hope, SS17 7AH

- 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 & Mrs D Topper against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00396/HHA, dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is Two storey side flank extension to allow for future incapacity/mobility. Single storey entry lobby and mobility vehicle charging point and shelter.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Number 194 Southend Road (No 194) is a contemporary style detached house with a dual pitched roof and a gabled front elevation. It is on a corner plot and at the end of a short row of similar dwellings set in a staggered line along the gently curving Southend Road.
4. The development would introduce a two-storey side extension which would extend to within 0.76m of the side plot boundary and which would nearly double the dwelling's rear elevation. The proposed flank elevation would project beyond the building line of dwellings on Goldings Crescent and would introduce significant mass and bulk onto the corner plot. Moreover, the roof would extend the existing ridge height which would further increase the development's visual dominance and bulk.
5. The existing spaciousness at the junction of Southend Road and Goldings Crescent which allows views along Goldings Crescent and behind the building line would be diminished. Although the existing shed would be removed, this is single storey and has a limited impact on views along Goldings Crescent.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to another side extension on a corner plot on Southend Road. However, the extension's ridge is lower than the host dwelling and the extension is also limited in width compared to the host dwelling. It is clearly subservient to the host dwelling. That would not be the case here. Development on Fairview Avenue has also been highlighted but the underlying building pattern is more rigid and the building lines are closer to the

back of the footway. The situations are not comparable. In any case, the existence of harm does not justify harm elsewhere and each appeal is determined on its merits.

7. I appreciate that the appellants wish to prepare for single floor living but the medial evidence regarding the long-term prognosis is limited. Nor is there anything to indicate whether other options which might allow access to the upper floor have been considered. Moreover, I note that although the proposed layout is only very slightly altered from a previous application, there is nothing before me to set out the spatial requirements of the additional ground floor room that might justify its proximity to the side plot boundary. I also noted at my visit that similar dwellings nearby have had rear extensions. As such, it seems to me that there are other design options which could have a lesser impact on the street scene.
8. Given the tight development pattern I conclude that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to the design aims of Policies CSTP22 and PDM2 of the Local Plan and guidance given in the SPD¹ which states that on corner plots particular attention should be paid to the contribution the extension makes to the street scene.

Conclusion

9. Whilst I appreciate the intent to prepare for assisted living, a balance has to be struck between the benefits arising to the appellants and the impact of the development on the immediate area. In this case, the supporting evidence for assisted living requirements is neither compelling nor comprehensive and consequently it is insufficient to outweigh the harm identified above in relation to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal is dismissed.

A Blicq

INSPECTOR

¹ Thurrock Design Guide Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD July 2017