



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/22/3294549

13 Arisdale Avenue, South Ockendon RM15 5AS

- 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 Nick Gover against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01886/HHA, dated 4 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 9th March 2022.
 - The proposed development is demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension and single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing garage and erection of a two storey extension and single storey front extension in accordance with the terms of application ref: 21/01886/HHA dated 4 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan (1:1250 scale); proposed site layout (1:500 scale); 101 (existing plans and elevations) and 301 (proposed plans and elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development shall match those used on the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The development shall not be occupied until two parking spaces have been provided within the site in accordance with a plan that shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved details shall thereafter be retained as such.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the host property and street scene and (b) highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises an end of terrace two storey dwelling with garden areas to the front, side and rear. It is located on the corner of Arisdale Avenue and Anton Road within a predominantly residential area. Arisdale Avenue is a wide road on the opposite side of which lies a large open space. The vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by similar terraces generally comprising of four properties.

4. The proposed two-storey extension would extend about 3.5 metres to the side of the existing dwelling but would be set back from the Anton Road frontage. The proposed single storey, front extension would extend across the whole of the two-storey addition and the existing front entrance of the dwelling to create a porch in the form of a lean-to addition.

Character and appearance

5. The Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD (RAE) states that corner plots require a distinct design that responds positively not only to the dwelling but also to the neighbouring houses. The Council refers specifically to paragraph 5.3.2 which states that two storey side extensions are generally not considered acceptable where the existing layout of detached or semi-detached housing is protected townscape; it sets out circumstances where it may be appropriate, including where on a corner plot not further than the building lines of both streets.
6. The proposed extension would extend beyond the 'notional building line' created by the properties to the north of the site in Anton Road. Whilst the site is not within a layout of detached or semi-detached housing, the RAE guidance also recommends that if the side extension would be on a corner plot, particular attention should be paid to how the extension will make a positive contribution, including considering landscaping and the side façade.
7. The proposed extensions would match the design, height and appearance of the existing terrace with brick elevations and tiled roof. This would reflect a 'seamless' approach as referred to in the RAE which in my view would be the appropriate treatment. Whilst it would result in the two-storey element of the terrace becoming more visible within the Anton Road frontage in what is quite a prominent location, I do not consider that this would result in an unacceptable impact. As indicated above, a relatively generous gap would be retained to the Anton Road frontage within which existing boundary features could be retained or new landscaping provided to soften its appearance.
8. I consider that this would ensure that the extension would not be overly dominant in the street scene and whilst it would extend beyond the 'notional' building line, an 'open' view looking south along Anton Road would be retained. The flank elevation would include openings in the form of a first floor window and ground floor window and door. As such I consider that its design would respond positively to the host dwelling and address its corner location and the neighbouring houses in both Arisdale Avenue and Anton Road.
9. For the above reasons, I do not consider that the proposed extension would have a detrimental impact on the street scene and would successfully integrate with the host dwelling. As such it would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property, street scene or wider area. It would therefore accord with Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Core Strategy (2015) (CS) which seek high quality development that positively responds to local context and the character of the area and provides a continuity of street frontage. I also consider that it would satisfy the general aims and objectives of the RAE.
10. 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.

Parking / highway safety

11. At the time of my site visit there were two vehicles parked in the area to the front of the dwelling which appeared to be accessed 'unofficially' from Arisdale Avenue, the former front brick boundary wall referred to by the Council having been removed. A number of other properties in the adjoining terrace had similar arrangements, some more 'formal' than others.
12. It seems to me that it would be possible for this arrangement to be 'regularised' and the appropriate number of parking spaces to meet the Council's standards served by a safe and suitable access. The Council also refers to the lack of information to show how this area could be safely accessed via a formal access. In these circumstances, it seems to me that the required information could be secured via a suitable condition requiring appropriate details to include the location of parking spaces and suitable visibility splays. This would ensure that there would be no harm to highway safety thereby complying with CS policies PMD2, PMD8 and PMD9 which seek to ensure that development is served by parking that complies with the Council's standards and is safely accessed.

Conclusions

13. For the above reasons I find that the proposal would comply with the development plan and would therefore be acceptable.
14. 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. A condition to secure appropriate parking provision is also necessary.
15. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR