



---

## 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: 11<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3280328**

**4 Crescent Avenue, Grays RM17 6AZ**

- 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 N Surblys against the decision of Thurrock Council.
  - The application Ref 21/00777/HHA, dated 7 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 July 2021.
  - The development proposed is a part single part two-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part single part two-storey rear extension and two-storey side extension at 4 Crescent Avenue, Grays RM17 6AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00777/HHA, dated 7 May 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 hereby permitted 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.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the semi-detached pair of which it forms part and that of the local area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached house with a two storey rear outrigger and a single storey rear extension beyond that. The main roof of

the house is half hipped in form, incorporating a single engaged dormer window with a pitched roof to the front that serves the existing first floor bedroom. The roof of the outrigger shares a half-hipped roof with the adjoining outrigger of its semi-detached pair. The existing single storey rear extension has a flat roof.

4. The design of the proposal appears to be in response to the Council's reasons for a refusal of an application<sup>1</sup> for a similar extension proposal. The main design difference being the narrower width of the proposed two storey extension and the concomitant inclusion of a single storey ground floor extension.
5. The proposed two storey part of the extension would wrap around the existing house to the full extent of its side, engaging with the existing rear outrigger to its full depth. At first floor level the two storey part of the proposed extension would have two large matching windows to the rear and a small window to the side elevation. At the ground floor the proposal would maintain the side entrance to the property, which would be by way of a double door in side-by-side format.
6. The side part of the proposed extension would replicate the existing half dormer roof form but would also incorporate an engaged dormer window to the front. This engaged dormer window would align with a new ground floor window in the proposed side extension that would also face the street. Although narrower than the existing engaged dormer, the proposed engaged dormer would be similar in design to the existing one and to those of its semi-detached pair. Given the width of the proposed side extension this dormer would appear as a proportionate and recessive addition to the appeal property and would be in keeping with the original appearance of the house and its extended semi-detached pair.
7. To the rear, the proposed extension would symmetrically replicate the half-hipped roof form of the existing outrigger. This would align with the replicated half hipped roof form above the side part of the proposed 2 storey extension. By maintaining and replicating the existing hipped roof forms for the two storey parts, the proposal would also result in the extension appearing as a congruent and subservient addition to the host property.
8. A further single storey side and rear extension is proposed that would wrap around the full width and depth of the rear part of the proposed two storey extension. This single storey extension would have a single shallow lean-to roof slope to the rear, with matching shallow pitched roof to its side part and would appear, along with the two storey extension, to be a proportionate and subservient addition to the appeal property.
9. There is currently a single detached garage that would be demolished to spatially accommodate the proposed extension. Given the existing gap that this would open up between the appeal property and its neighbour at 6 Crescent Avenue, along with the good sized rear gardens of the appeal property and its semi-detached pair, the proposal would not appear to be an overbearing addition to the appeal property.

---

<sup>1</sup> Planning Ref: 21/00179/HHA

10. Although the proposal would be a slightly truncated version of the recent extension to the appeal property's adjoining semi-detached pair, it would still represent a significant extension of the existing house. As such, the proposal, although not entirely symmetrical with its adjoining neighbour, would appear to go some way towards rebalancing the appearance of the semi-detached pair, as well as reflecting their original design and architectural detailing.
11. For these reasons I find that the proposal would integrate with the existing house and would be in harmony with its already significantly extended semi-detached pair and the street scene of the local area. The proposal would, therefore, cause no harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or 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**

12. I have had regard to 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 also imposed a condition that controls its hours.

### **Conclusion**

13. The appeal is allowed.

*Victor Callister*

INSPECTOR