
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2022

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/22/3300970

50 Velmar Avenue, Stanford-Le-Hope, Essex SS17 0NF

- 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 Sanjayan Selvarasa against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00080/FUL, dated 19 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of structure to front of shop to provide covered shopping area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal relates to this small shop which is located in a small parade of commercial properties, within an otherwise mainly residential area. The parade is identified by the Council as a Smaller Neighbourhood parade. The terrace of 3 properties is constructed of brick elevations, with tiled roofs and are of a similar scale to the surrounding residential properties.
4. The development has already been undertaken and consists of a timber frame and plastic sheeting structure at the front of the shop. It spans the full width of the property and the plans indicate that it is 2.7m in depth.
5. The appearance of the structure and the materials used do not match any of the features of the existing building or those of its neighbours. Its design and appearance are rudimentary and the choice of materials heightens this effect. It appears as an obvious addition to the terrace which fails to harmonise with it. I strongly disagree with the appellant's statement which suggests that it is a high quality of design. It sits within this prominent position and has a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.
6. The appellant indicates that the development seeks to make the best use of the land by providing additional room for the shop. In my judgement, any benefits in this respect are far outweighed by its unacceptable effect on the area.

Conclusion

7. The development has a clear and unacceptable visual effect on the character and appearance of the area. It represents poor design and is placed in a prominent position. For these reasons, it is contrary to Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy. I consider that there are no matters which outweigh that conflict. As a consequence, the appeal is dismissed.

T Wood

INSPECTOR