



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18TH March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/21/3282750

21 Falcon Avenue, South Ockendon RM15 5FQ

- 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 Virginijus Pudlauskas against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00620/HHA, dated 14 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2021
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and single storey side extension as garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The Character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area; and
 - The effective use and safety of the highway.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the description of the development varies between the documents submitted for the purposes of this appeal, I have used the description from the Council's decision notice, as this more accurately describes the development.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached gable ended two storey house, located in an area of similar semi-detached properties, on what appears to be a recently completed planned estate of closely developed properties. The appeal site sits on the corner of the street, at its junction with an access road to a close of similar properties to the rear, from where the rear roof slope of the house is visible. To the other side of the access road is a small 3 storey block of flats.
5. The proposal is for a flat roofed dormer extension to the rear roof slope and a single storey side extension with a lean-to roof that would provide a garage.

6. The proposed rear dormer extension would take the form of a 'box' type roof extension, which would be the full width and depth of the existing house. The roof of the proposed dormer would be ostensibly flat, with only a slight incline for what appears to be for drainage purposes. The proposed dormer would be tile clad on all three sides, with two windows that align with and replicate the form of the existing windows in the rear elevation.
7. Due to the proposed extent of the proposed rear dormer extension, it would not accord with the design guidance for roof extensions given in Section 5.4 of the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the DSPD). This sets out guidance that such extensions on visible rear roof slopes should not occupy more than half of the width of the roof and be a minimum of 0.3 metres below ridge height and 0.6 metres from the roof edge or verge. The design guidance given in the SPD is advice that should be considered along with the individual circumstances.
8. As it would be the full width and depth of the house, the proposed dormer extension would be excessive in scale. This would, along with its flat roof and boxy design, result in it appearing as disproportionate and dominating, such that it would unbalance the appearance of the appeal property and its semi-detached pair.
9. Due to the width of the adjacent access road, the proposed extension would be unduly prominent in views of the appeal property from the street, but more particular from the close at the rear. This prominence would result in the excessive scale and box form of the proposed dormer differentiating the appeal property from its neighbours and would result in the appeal property appearing as incongruous when viewed in concert with neighbouring houses and therefore detrimental to the streetscene.
10. The proposed side extension is designed as a lean-to roofed garage that would be located on the existing driveway, which is adjacent to the access road to the close to the rear of the property, and currently provides parking for two cars.
11. In scale and design the proposed garage would be in keeping with that of the appeal property and, by being set back from its main elevation, would not appear as unduly prominent. It would also visually break up the existing extensive plain flank gable end of the house. The proposal would, therefore, appear as a recessive and complementary addition to the appeal property, which would not unbalance it in relation to its semi-detached pair. I deal with the related parking issue below.

Parking

12. Although significantly wider than the dimension given in the Thurrock Parking Design and Development Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2020) (the PSPD) for single garages, the proposed garage extension would be significantly shallower. There is nothing before me to suggest that the proposed garage, despite being shallower than the Council's given dimensions for garages, would be suitable for car parking.
13. The proposal would also result in the retention of a single parking space on the driveway that would accord with the dimensions of a parking space given by the Council in the PSPD for minimum parking bay standards in exceptional

circumstances. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate the existence of any exceptional circumstances in this case.

14. The appeal property would appear to be in an area of low public transport accessibility, where the loss of off street parking provision would also place demands on street parking. From my site visit there did not appear to be a significant excess of on street parking provision in the local area. The loss of off street parking space in these circumstances would result in increased pressure on the street and surrounding streets for car parking and would impact on the use of the street by other road users. I have been provided with no information by the appellant that would indicate the contrary.
15. For the reason given above, I find that, when considered as a whole, the proposed development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area and would result in moderate harm to the effective use and safety of the highway. The proposal would not, therefore, accord with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2, PMD8 and PMD9 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015) and Sections 9 and 12 of the Framework. These collectively seek to ensure that development, including extensions, demonstrate high quality design, responding to the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings, comply with adopted parking standards and do not have unacceptable impacts on the road network or highway safety.

Conclusion

16. The development is in conflict with the development plan and there are no considerations that outweigh this conflict. I conclude, therefore, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR