



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2021

by G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/20/3261235

5 Malpas Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex RM16 4QX

- 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 Wayne Nelson against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00604/FUL, dated 19 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a new dwelling to side plot adjacent to 5 Malpas Road.
-

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. The residential area is generally formed of terraces of two storey properties set back from the road. No.5 is an end of terrace property and occupies a corner plot with a large side garden to Malpas Road. At the other end of the terrace is a larger property which faces Ingleby Road (No.20). The design of the proposed property would effectively replicate the form of No.20, albeit with the frontage to the west in line with No.5.
4. Notwithstanding the general design, which would be in keeping with the existing terrace, the space to the side of No.5 provides a notable break to the built form at the end of the cul de sac. The proposed development would extend across most of the plot with a limited set back from the road. In my view this would interrupt the street pattern and, given the slight curve to Malpas Road, it would be a prominent property creating a sense of enclosure both in views along Malpas Road and along the terrace from Ingleby Road.
5. I accept, as highlighted by the appellant, that there are other terraces with a hammerhead form in the vicinity, however these are generally sited where two roads join with the terrace relating to both street scenes.
6. This terrace occupies a different position, it has no road to the front and the proposed property would not align with the established building line in Malpas Road to its rear. It would also present a large flank elevation close to Malpas Road significantly reducing the existing sense of space. I acknowledge that the scheme would set the boundary fence back, thereby physically opening up the

site at ground level, nevertheless this would not address the overall loss of openness or the prominence of the new property.

7. Overall, the development would not reflect the prevailing character, nor would it positively contribute to an enhancement of the area. Thus, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would be contrary to policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Local Development Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development DPD which require that all proposals are of high quality design, respond to the site and its surroundings and contribute positively to the character of the area and sense of place.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has also identified that the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, and that the development provides acceptable parking and garden provisions, as confirmed by the Council. Be that as it may, it indicates a lack of harm in these matters rather than benefits of the scheme.
9. I am also aware that there is support from neighbours to the design of the new property and that the appellant made changes to the scheme to address previous concerns, however these matters do not change my conclusion on the main issue.

Planning Balance

10. The appellant has stated that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, a statement which is unchallenged by the Council. In this circumstance, paragraph 11(d) of the Framework applies, and the adverse impacts of the proposed development must be weighed against the benefits.
11. The proposal would contribute to the housing supply providing a 2 bedroom property in an established residential area accessible to local facilities. There would also be economic investment in the short term from its construction and subsequent occupation. Nonetheless, as a single dwelling the social and economic benefits would be limited. The harm to the character and appearance of the area identified would be significant and as a result the environmental role of sustainable development would not be achieved.
12. In summary, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and since there are only limited benefits to the proposed development, as described above, overall, I consider that the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR