



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

by G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3293511

Tyndall Cottages, 33 Christchurch Road, Tilbury RM18 7RD

- 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 Adam Wilks against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01719/HHA, dated 1 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing conservatory and side porch for new single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of existing conservatory and side porch for new single storey side extension at Tyndall Cottages, 33 Christchurch Road, Tilbury RM18 7RD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01719/HHA, dated 1 October 2021, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: nos. PL02 and PL03 Revision A.
 - 3) 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 Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi detached house, occupying a corner plot within a residential area of similar style properties. The properties are set on well established building lines giving a sense of uniformity to the townscape.
4. On my site visit I saw that the two storey end terrace house (No 31 Christchurch Road), on the opposite side of the entrance to Manor Road, is positioned noticeably forward of the general building line on Manor Road and close to the highway. The spaciousness of the side garden of the appeal property and the proximity of No 31 to the highway does not reflect the general uniform character of the area.

5. Moreover, the appeal property and No 31 opposite, are orientated to face Christchurch Road, and are well separated from the houses fronting Manor Road by their deep rear gardens. As such, and despite the similarities between the design of the buildings, I saw that the pattern of development at the appeal site is of a noticeably different character to Manor Road.
6. In this context, and notwithstanding its position forward of the Manor Road building line, the modestly sized extension would not disrupt the existing building line or dominate the corner plot. It would relate well to No 31, opposite, where it would provide a sense of consistency to the built form at the entrance to the Road. Furthermore, the matching roof form, materials and render finish would respect the appearance of the host property and the rhythm of roof profiles in the locality. The front facing window would be proportionate in size to the front wall of the extension, and comparable to the size and style of windows in the host property.
7. For these reasons, I find that the proposed extension would respond positively to its context. It would respect the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area, in accordance with Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework - Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development DPD (as amended) (2015). These policies require development to be of high quality design and to respect the positive characteristics of the townscape, amongst other objectives. It also complies with the aims of The Thurrock Design Guide: Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (the "SPD"), which requires side extensions on corner plots to contribute positively to their location and respect the context of the street. The policies are consistent with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), which requires developments to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character, amongst other matters.
8. I have had regard to the guidance in paragraph 5.3.2 of the SPD. However, it concerns two storey side extensions on corner plots and therefore is not comparable with the appeal proposal. It does not lead me away from my findings on the main issue.

Conditions

9. To be in keeping with the appearance of the area, it is necessary for the materials to match the host property. For certainty, it is necessary for the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal proposal is consistent with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations that indicate otherwise. The appeal should be allowed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR