



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3253862

84 Christchurch Road, Tilbury, Essex, RM18 7RD

- 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 Alina Hurjui against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00144/HHA, dated 3 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The Council's development plan policies CSTP22 and PMD2 in the Thurrock LDF Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development DPD (as amended) 2015 require that development is of a high quality design and contributes positively towards creating a sense of place. The Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Design Guide SPD seeks to ensure that front extensions complement the character of the street.
3. The appeal dwelling is a modern, mid terraced two storey house set behind a short front garden, within a residential area of modern and Victorian terraced housing. Whilst the dwellings are modest and some have been altered with a variety of extensions over the years, it is clear that each terrace, whether modern or traditional, was built with a high degree of uniformity. Those that remain largely unaltered, such as the adjacent Victorian terrace and the adjacent modern terrace either side of this terrace, make a positive contribution to the character of the area by reason of the uniformity within the terrace.
4. Within this terrace, two of the middle dwellings, shown as nos 86 and 86A on the plans, are largely unaltered on the front elevation with the original small flat roof projection with timber cladding to the side of the front door and retain their original 1960's character. Those at either end have been substantially altered with porch extensions and canopies across the remaining frontage, one with a pitched and gabled roof and rendered walls, one with a pitched and hipped roof with brick walls. As such, they do not reflect the original character of the terrace and have disrupted its uniformity.

5. The appeal dwelling sits between an unaltered dwelling and an altered one. The proposed extension would replace an existing porch extension. It would extend across the full width of the dwelling with the same forward projection as the existing porch. Whilst it would be greater in width than the existing extensions in the terrace which have only canopies covering the full width, those canopies have a strong visual impact and the width of the proposed extension would therefore be acceptable in this context.
6. However, the scale and form of the continuous pitched roof would fail to reflect the flat roofs of the original design of the terrace and would appear unduly bulky in the street scene. Its greater eaves and ridge heights would also create an awkward junction with the adjoining hipped roof at no 82. Furthermore, the use of brickwork across the whole frontage would fail to reflect the timber cladding and mix of materials in the original design. As such, its design would fail to reflect the original, 1960's character of the dwelling and the terrace. Rather than creating a sense of individuality as the appellant claims, it would disrupt the remaining uniformity and character of the terrace.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension, by reason of its scale and design, would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area and would be contrary to development plan policies CSTP22 and PMD2 and to the Council's SPD. The appeal is dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector