
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3299883

96 Hemley Road, Orsett, Grays, Essex RM16 3DQ

- 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 Daniel Sheraton against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02105/HHA was refused by notice dated 25 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side extension, first floor side extension and part garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On the appeal form it is stated that the appeal is with regard to varying a condition. However, the planning application is for an extension to a dwelling and thus I have determined the appeal on this basis. I have described the development as that stated on the planning application form.

Main Issues

3. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is an end of terrace modern two-storey dwelling. The appeal development is substantially completed. I note that planning permission was previously granted for an extension. The development undertaken does not accord with that planning permission Ref: 20/01812/HHA. The most notable difference is that the eaves height of the extension are set above the eaves height of the existing dwelling, whereas the existing planning permission allowed for consistent eaves heights. In addition, the first-floor side extension has been rendered.
 5. The dwellings in the vicinity of the site are mostly terraces or semi-detached dwellings, where eaves heights on these terraces or on the semi-detached dwellings are consistent. The surrounding dwellings are predominately brick.
-

These features make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area. Examples of rendered finish are situated further away.

6. Guidance in the Thurrock Design Guide Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD (2017) is for side extensions to be special, seamless or subservient. From my observations, the development, due to the eaves height and rendering, appears as an incongruous addition to the dwelling. Due to these design matters, it is neither special, seamless or subservient. This discordant addition significantly detracts from the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. In such a prominent location, where both the front and rear of the first floor are publicly visible, I consider that the development is poorly related to the design and roof forms of surrounding dwellings to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. In reaching my decision, I have had regard to all matters raised including the complexity of construction of the roof addition in the existing approved planning permission. Nevertheless, the harm I have identified is of such a material nature that I have dismissed the appeal. Thus the development is contrary to guidance in the SPD and Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 in the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) 2015, where they seek to ensure extensions are of a high quality design, which contribute positively to the character of the area. I consider these policies to be broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, especially where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR