



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2022

**by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 15<sup>TH</sup> February 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3285109**

**27 Fyfield Drive, South Ockendon, RM15 5QE**

- 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 Richard Soetan against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00736/HHA, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2021.
  - The development proposed is a double storey rear and double storey side extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 28 and 29 Fyfield Drive with particular reference to visual impact.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with a steeply pitched main roof. The gable is orientated 'end-on' to the access road that serves this small group of houses. It is within a wider residential area and this part of the estate features a consistent palette of materials which provides a sense of coherence even though the individual house types are varied.
4. The proposal would result in a significant expansion in the size of the building. The Thurrock Design Guide *Residential Alterations and Extensions* SPD specifies a 30% plot coverage limit for dwellings with a curtilage measuring between 100 and 500 sq m. However, there is no clear evidence that this would be breached. The rear extension would perpetuate the existing form of the dwelling in a similar manner to the addition undertaken at No 25. Although the side extension would be along the boundary there would be a reasonable gap to the houses at Nos 28 and 29. Given that the area is fairly densely developed, the enlarged dwelling would not appear overly cramped on the plot.
5. However, the roof pitch of the side extension would be considerably slacker than the existing one. The resulting ungainly appearance would be fully visible from Fyfield Drive. As the proposal would be poorly integrated with the main original dwelling it would fail to respect and respond positively to its character such that this would not be maintained as expected by the SPD. Indeed, the

side extension would contrast unfavourably with the form and roof profile of the existing house as well as with the prevailing pattern and style of development nearby. It would be discordant in the local scene.

6. Therefore the character and appearance of the area would be harmed. The proposed development would conflict with Policies PMD2 and CST22 of the Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development. These promote high quality design and require that proposals respond to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.

#### *Living conditions*

7. According to the appellant the side extension would be some 13m away from the rear facing windows of 28 and 29 Fyfield Drive. Whilst two existing flank windows would be removed, the new built form would be closer to their gardens. Furthermore, the outline of that elevation would markedly larger compared to what is there now. Its length and proximity would lead to a greater visual impact and one that would be overbearing and oppressive. As the extension would occupy most of the width of the rear amenity areas of the adjoining properties, the sense of enclosure would be excessive.
8. Therefore the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 28 and 29 Fyfield Road. It would be contrary to Core Strategy Policy PMD1 which indicates that development will not be permitted if it would cause unacceptable effects on the amenity of others.

#### **Other Matters**

9. It is understandable that the appellant was disappointed by the refusal of the application when it had the support of the case officer following changes to overcome the concerns identified. However, the appeal has been considered afresh and so these events have no bearing on this assessment.

#### **Conclusion**

10. The proposal would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

*David Smith*

INSPECTOR