
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2021

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3268259

5 Branksome Close, Stanford-Le-Hope, Essex SS17 8BA

- 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 Nick Tew against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00870/HHA was refused by notice dated 13 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension with pitched roof and single-storey side extension to be used as a garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for Costs

2. An application for partial costs has been made by Mr Nick Tew against Thurrock Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be:

the effect of the proposed single-storey side extension on the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area; and

the effect of the proposal on pedestrian and highway safety in the immediate locality.

Reasons

4. The appeal property lies within a primarily residential area at the end of a cul-de-sac. This area is characterised by a mix of predominately semi-detached dwellings of various designs. Some of these dwellings have been extended.
 5. Guidance in paragraph 4.3.1 in The Thurrock Design Guide 2017 states: *the form and scale of the extension or outbuilding should be appropriate to the original dwelling and the surrounding development pattern*. In addition, this guidance seeks to avoid the adding of false pitched roofs or crowns to the face of flat roofs.
-

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet dwelling with a side projection above a carport. The proposal includes a side extension adjacent to a public footpath that runs down the side of the property. This side boundary is set at an angle. The proposed garage would join to the existing dwelling at the rear enclosing the existing carport. From my observations, due to the angle of the proposal, it would appear as an awkward and contrived addition to the dwelling. In addition, the proposed roof design would introduce two different interconnecting roof styles. This awkward design would appear as an unacceptably incongruous addition not in keeping with the character of the existing dwelling. In such a prominent location, this would be to the detriment of the character of the surrounding area.
7. The proposal identifies parking spaces for two vehicles on the site. The proposal includes a front porch and I am satisfied that this would be smaller in size and therefore less restricting upon vehicle manoeuvring than the existing porch. Nevertheless, due to the position of the proposed porch together with needing to manoeuvre into a garage door rather than the open car port, I consider that it would be extremely difficult to park two cars on the site without considerable awkward manoeuvring. As there is very limited on street parking available at the end of this cul-de-sac and as there is a footpath adjoining the side boundary, I conclude on this matter that this situation could significantly adversely affect pedestrian and highway safety.
8. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character of the existing dwelling and surrounding area and on pedestrian and highway safety. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to guidance in the Thurrock Design Guide 2017 and contrary to Policies CSTP22, PMD2 and PMD8 in the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015), where they seek to promote high quality design that contributes positively to the character of the area and seek safe parking provision.
9. Since the Council made its decision, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. It continues to seek high standards of design and highway safety. I consider the policies above to be broadly consistent with the Framework where the Framework seeks to ensure good design and highway safety.
10. I have been referred to Core Strategy Policy PMD9 regarding new access or the increased use of existing accesses. This is not relevant to the proposal before me.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR