
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2021

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3269113

47 Solway, East Tilbury, RM18 8RQ

- 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 Oliver against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01461/HHA, dated 26 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single-storey front extension at 47 Solway, East Tilbury, RM18 8RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/01461/HHA, dated 26 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos 1750-A001, 1750-A002 and 1750-A005.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, middle property within a short terrace of three (Nos 46, 47 and 48) and located within a wider, post-war residential estate comprising principally detached and semi-detached dwellings of originally similar style. The properties in the terrace were all originally identical and with forward projecting, integral garages to one side, with a flat roof and recessed

porch attached to the side. Whilst these features remain, there is now little consistency between the houses. Nos 47 and 48 have converted their garages to living accommodation. The flat roof over the original garage to the appeal property has been replaced with a mono-pitched roof. No 48 has remodelled the appearance of the dwelling with a contemporary look including smooth white render in place of brick and tile hanging, and coloured window frames. The first floor, front window proportions between the three properties also differ. As such, I could find little uniformity to the architecture of the terrace that was of any significance.

4. The proposal would extend the forward projection sideways to span the full width of the property. The roof over would be hipped. It would not extend forward of the existing building line and given the existing mix, I am satisfied that it would sufficiently complement the character of the street, compliant with the guiding principles of the Council's *Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD July 2017* as it relates to front extensions and porches.
5. The extension would be finished with materials and fenestration to match the existing. Although there would be change to the appearance of the dwelling and terrace as a whole, the proposal would merely add to an existing mix in a manner that in my view would appear neither dominant nor incongruous within the street scene. I therefore find no conflict with Policies CSTP22 or PMD2 of the Council's Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) January 2015 insofar as they relate to the quality of design within the local context. Neither do I find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well-designed places.

Conditions

6. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. In the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the area a condition is required to control the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the street scene. Therefore, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR