

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2023

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3308889

1 Kershaw Close, Chafford Hundred, Grays RM16 6RN

- 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 Donatas Gludzinskas against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00882/HHA, dated 23 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant indicates that the original description of development has changed. Therefore, the above description reflects the amended description shown on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling in a modern residential estate, which includes dwellings of varied size and design.
5. Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development document (2015) (the Core Strategy) require development to respond to and respect the character of the area, and to provide a high quality of design. The *Thurrock Design Guide, Residential Alterations & Extensions* Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that the form and scale of the extension should be appropriate to the original dwelling and the surrounding development pattern¹.

¹ Paragraph 4.3.1.

6. Reference is made to a previous proposal for a similar form of development at the appeal property². While I note this, this appeal involves a separate proposal, which I have considered on its individual merits.
7. The appeal property is of simple design, with a rectangular plan form and gable ends to front and rear. The side extension would also include a gable end to the side with a similar roof form of subordinate height to the original dwelling. As such, it would reflect the existing design and proportions and seen in isolation would not result in material harm, either due to its size or details, including the fenestration.
8. However, No 1 is part of a planned layout of development with a good degree of uniformity amongst groups of dwellings. For example, those opposite the appeal site on Grifon Road are larger detached dwellings, while the appeal property and its immediate neighbour are more modestly-sized. The proposed extension would, therefore, be seen in the context of this planned mix and grouping of types of dwellings. The larger, extended dwelling would unbalance the planned layout, particularly with regard to the visual relationship with the neighbouring dwelling.
9. More significantly, the space to the side of No 1 provides an open aspect next to the boundary with the footpath, which is characteristic of the general set-back of properties with front or side boundaries on the main estate roads. This set-back from the side boundary also means that the side elevation of the appeal property is broadly consistent with the frontages of properties behind No 1 along Rainbow Road, enabling views of them from the junction of Rainbow and Grifon Roads close to the appeal property.
10. The extension would largely infill the gap to the boundary and so would harmfully reduce the characteristic open aspect to the side, breaching the nominal building line with the properties to the rear on Rainbow Road. This would result in an incongruous and uncharacteristic layout of development with the extended dwelling appearing cramped and a form of overdevelopment due to its proximity to the side boundary. There is some existing planting to the side boundary, but this is insufficient to screen the effects of the proposed extension so close to this boundary. While additional planting could be required by condition, such planting should not be viewed as desirable simply to conceal an otherwise harmful form of development.
11. The appellant contends that the proposed extension is no different from many others in the surrounding area, with two particular examples referred to. However, these are not part of the same street scene and do not reflect the particular circumstances and layout of development in relation to the appeal site. As such, they cannot be considered as directly comparable to or precedents for the appeal proposal.
12. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it is contrary to Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and to the SPD, as described above. It is also

² Ref 21/00363/HHA.

contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes high quality design.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR