



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: 15TH February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3282389

3 St. Paul's Place, Aveley, RM15 4SA

- 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 Miss Priya Sohal against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00756/HHA, dated 3 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front lounge extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front lounge extension at 3 St. Paul's Place, Aveley, RM15 4SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00756/HHA, dated 3 May 2021, 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 drawing numbers A01, A04 and A05.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. St Paul's Place appears to have been constructed at a later date than St Paul's Close but for the purposes of assessing the character of the immediate area they should be regarded as one entity. Within it, there is a wide variety of front extensions and porches. Some of them extend across the entire frontage of the property as proposed at the appeal site. They include the front extension permitted at 1 St Paul's Close.
4. As a result there is no clear pattern of front extensions and the layout of the houses is often staggered so that there is no strongly defined building line. By perpetuating the lean-to roof and alignment of the existing front projection, the design of this modest infill addition would harmonise with the existing dwelling. Therefore it would complement the character of the street as expected by the Thurrock Design Guide *Residential Alterations and Extensions* SPD.

5. Consequently the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed. The proposed front extension would not conflict with Policies PMD2 and CST22 of the Core Strategy which promote high quality design and require that proposals respond to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.

Conditions

6. The plans should be specified in the interests of certainty and matching materials used to ensure that the extension blends in seamlessly.

Conclusion

7. The proposed development would accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should succeed.

David Smith

INSPECTOR