



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2022

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3287783

84 Bradleigh Avenue, Grays RM17 5RJ

- 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 Shah Alom against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01241/HHA, dated 13 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and part single storey, part two storey rear extension with Juliette balcony.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and part single storey, part two storey rear extension with Juliette balcony at 84 Bradleigh Avenue, Grays RM17 5RJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01241/HHA, dated 13 July 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The first floor bathroom window in the rear elevation of the extension shall at all times be glazed with obscured glass and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor shall be capable of being opened.
 - 4) No construction work shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 8.00am and 1pm on Saturdays. There shall be no working on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Procedural Matters

2. As the description of development varies between the documents submitted for this appeal, I have used the description from Thurrock Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes the development and has also been used by the appellant in their submission.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey hipped roof semi-detached house with attached flat roofed single garage and separate front and side/rear garden areas. The appeal property's semi-detached pair has already been the subject of a flat roofed first floor side extension, above its attached garage. This results in an existing unbalanced appearance between the semi-detached pair.
5. To the side, the proposal would replace the existing single storey attached garage with a two storey extension. This would be set back from the front elevation, aligning with the existing rear elevation and would incorporate an enlarged garage with space for 1 car, with a new bedroom and two bathrooms above.
6. To the rear, the ground floor part of the proposed extension would create a new kitchen dining area, which would be the full combined width of the existing house and proposed side extension. The first floor of the rear part of the proposed extension would provide an additional bedroom. This would be approximately just over a third of the floorspace of the ground floor of the rear part of the extension and positioned towards the centre of the house as extended and would incorporate a Juliette balcony. The roof of both the proposed side and rear extensions would be hipped in form and would engage with the existing roof accordingly, albeit with a lower ridge height than the existing roof.
7. From the front, the proposal would result in a significant sideways extension to the appeal property that, although slightly wider than that of its semi-detached pair, would be set back from the existing front elevation. This, along with the proposed hipped roof, would result in it appearing as a congruent and subservient addition to the host property and would rebalance the appearance of the semi-detached pair, appropriately reflecting their original design and detailing and general proportions.
8. Although the proposal would result in a larger house than the existing and slightly larger than its extended semi-detached pair, this would reflect the streetscene of the area, where many semi-detached houses have been individually altered and extended in a variety of scales, forms and finishes. Some of these have been brought to my attention by the appellant.
9. From my site visit, it is evident that, where these nearby extensions to semi-detached properties have been set back from the front elevation of their host property and have hipped roof forms to match that of their host buildings, they successfully extend their host property. Where this is the case, it has been achieved without detracting from the separation between semi-detached pairs and the appearance of spaciousness this lends to the streetscene of the local area. I have, therefore, afforded this significant weight in my consideration of the proposal.
10. As the appeal property is located on a generous corner plot at the junction of Bradleigh Avenue with Tennyson Avenue, extensive and longer views of the

property are afforded from both streets. In these views the design of the appeal property makes no allowances for its corner location and replicates the form of other semi-detached properties that just have their front elevation facing the street.

11. The proposal would infill much of the existing space to the side of the appeal property, which given the width of the plot, currently appears as a weak element in the local streetscene when viewed from both streets. The proposal would, therefore, provide a visually stronger corner element, slightly improving the character and appearance of the local area.
12. For these reasons I do not find that the proposal would constitute an overbearing addition to the appeal property that would result in it appearing to have a dominating effect on its semi-detached pair or the local street scene. The proposal would, therefore, cause no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and would result in a slight enhancement to that of the local area. This would be in compliance with design guidance given in the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and would, therefore, accord with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which collectively seek to ensure that development demonstrates high quality design and responds to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the proposed conditions suggested by the council in the event of the appeal being allowed. I have included the standard required condition relating to the timing of implementation, and to ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the appearance of the existing house, I have included a condition relating to the matching of materials. To protect privacy, I have also imposed a condition relating to glazing at the first floor level of the proposed extension and to avoid local disturbance during construction I have attached a condition that controls its hours.

Conclusion

14. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR