



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/22/3290940

6 Whitmore Avenue, Stifford Clays, Grays RM16 2JA

- 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 Steve Pitt against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01620/HHA, dated 20 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a conservatory to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a conservatory to rear of property at 6 Whitmore Avenue, Stifford Clays, Grays RM16 2JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01620/HHA, dated 20 September 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 external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. 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

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace house, located on the inside of a right angled bend on the street, in an area of similar short blocks of terraced houses with front and rear gardens.
4. The proposal is for a single storey conservatory type extension with a hipped roof that would adjoin to the rear of an existing single storey side extension with lean to roof. When viewed from that part of the street that runs to the side of the appeal property, the proposal would be exposed to extensive views from the public realm, where its roof would be visible above the brick boundary wall to the property.
5. Whilst the roof form of the proposal would not match that of the existing side extension in form, the pitch angle of the roof of the proposal would match that

of the existing extension. When viewed from that part of the street that runs along the side of the appeal property, the proposal would, therefore, appear to be congruent with the existing roof angles and would not appear as having an awkward or disjointed relationship with the house as currently extended.

6. Further, the glazed hipped roof form and lower ridge and eaves height would result in the proposed extension appearing as a subservient conservatory type addition to the appeal property. The proposal would therefore be consistent with the local street scene and in conformity with the design guidance given in Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017).
7. For these reasons the proposal would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property or that of the local area and would, therefore accord with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015) and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which seek to ensure that development demonstrates high quality design and responds to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.

Conditions

8. As well as the standard condition for the timing of implementation, I have, to maintain character and appearance of the host property and that of the local area, included a condition requiring that the materials to be used match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

9. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR