



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3291610

9 Langthorne Crescent, Grays RM17 5XA

- 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 Elizabeth Nnamudi against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02043/HHA, dated 29 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The proposed development is first storey side extension over existing ground floor store room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first storey side extension over existing ground floor store room in accordance with the terms of application ref: 21/02043/HHA dated 29 November 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) This development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1713-1-LP (location plan); 1713-1-4A (block plan); 1713-1-1 (existing plans); 1713-1-2A (proposed plans); 1713-1-3A (existing and proposed elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. Langthorne Crescent is a pleasant tree lined street comprising wholly of residential properties. The appeal site comprises a relatively large semi-detached dwelling set within a frontage of similar properties on the north side of the road. Semi-detached properties also lie opposite the site on the southern side of the road though these are of more modest scale. The appeal property, and those along the northern side of the road, have large projecting front gables with bay windows beneath which provide distinctive and prominent features in the street scene. No. 9 is part of the semi-detached pair with No. 11. However, Nos. 7 and 9 are also 'attached' by virtue of single storey stores to the side of each property under a pitched roof.

4. The proposed extension to the appeal property would be above this attached store but set back from the front elevation and set in from the common boundary with No. 7 as well as having a ridge height below the main ridge of the host dwelling and that of its front projecting gable. The size and position of the addition is such that in most views along the street scene it would not be readily seen as it would be 'hidden' by the projecting gables at the front of the dwellings on the appeal site and that of the adjoining dwelling.
5. The proposal would be apparent in views from the other side of the road directly opposite the property and in this view, the extension would have the effect of reducing the visual gap at first floor level above the attached stores. The existing gap is narrow compared to others along the northern side of the road but does afford views of the tops of mature trees in the rear gardens.
6. However, whilst the design and appearance of the original semi-detached properties in the row within which the appeal site is located has a relatively uniform and distinctive appearance, the layout of the dwellings varies considerably such that there is no similar uniformity to the gaps between the semi-detached pairs. Some of the pairs have gaps at ground and first floor level, whereas others on corner plots have wider gaps than that at the appeal site at first floor. In another instance, a property has been extended at first floor level right up to the side boundary, albeit that adjoins a gap created by a public footpath leading to the road to the north. It is also notable that extensions to properties opposite the appeal site have, in some instances, completely 'closed the gap' at first floor level.
7. For the above reasons, I do not find that the proposed extension would be 'highly visible' as suggested by the Council nor do I consider that it would detract from the host property or the symmetrical appearance of the semi-detached pair given its relatively small scale and set-back position, with the forward projecting gables remaining as the dominant elements. Whilst it would reduce the visual gap between Nos. 7 and 9 at first floor level, it would not have an unacceptably harmful impact given the lack of uniformity within the wider streetscene and the limited view from which it would be apparent.
8. Overall, in the above circumstances, I consider that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host property or the wider area. It would thereby accord with Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Core Strategy (2015) which seek high quality development that positively responds to local context and the character of the area. It would also satisfy the aims and objectives of the Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD which seek to ensure that development respects and responds positively to the host dwelling and its context. I also find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks well designed places that function well and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusions

9. Conditions to relate to the approved plans and to ensure that matching materials are used are necessary in the interests of proper planning and the visual amenity of the area. I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR