

Appeal Decisions

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 A Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3309873
96 Hamble Lane, South Ockendon RM15 5HP

- 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 and Mrs Steadman against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00740/HHA, dated 26 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3302128
96 Hamble Lane, South Ockendon RM15 5HP

- 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 and Mrs Steadman against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00217/HHA, dated 8 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey side extension.
-

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above, there are two appeals concerning different side extensions to the same property. As two separate appeals have been made, I have considered each proposal on its individual merits.
4. For Appeal B, the description of development on the application form is a two storey side extension. However, the appeal form refers to a single storey side extension, which is confirmed by the submitted plans and other documents. Therefore, the above description reflects the fact that the proposal is for a single storey side extension.

Main Issue

5. The main issue with regard to both appeals is the effect of the proposed extension in each case on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey end-of-terrace dwelling in a residential road of similar properties, with woodland on the opposite side of Hamble Lane.
7. Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 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.
8. Reference is made to various previous proposals for side extensions to the appeal property. While I note these, the two appeals involve separate proposals which I have considered on their individual merits.

Appeal A

9. No 96 is part of a group of eight short terraces that are perpendicular to Hamble Lane with grassed amenity areas between each pair of facing terraces. There is a good degree of uniformity across the terraced dwellings as a whole, particularly due to their similar size and their layout on largely consistent two storey building lines. The grassed amenity areas, the position of the terraces perpendicular to the road and generous spaces to the end of each terrace next to Hamble Lane provides a spacious and open layout of development that complements the woodland opposite.
10. The proposed extension would replace the small single storey extension to the side and would continue the two storey built form and pitched roof profile, with a material increase to the frontage width of the host dwelling. Due to this increase in size the extended dwelling would appear considerably larger than its immediate neighbours in the terrace, resulting in an overly dominant and incongruous appearance in the otherwise uniform setting. This difference would be particularly apparent due to the appeal property's position next to the footpath and road frontage. Moreover, the sideways extension would largely infill the existing gap to the boundary, thereby undermining the original planned layout by extending beyond the consistent building line. As such, the proposal would harmfully effect the spacious and open character of the street scene.
11. These findings are consistent with those in a previous appeal decision for a similar form of extension at No 142 Hamble Lane, drawn to my attention by the

¹ Paragraph 4.3.1.

Council². In that case the Inspector found that the two storey extension in a similar end-of-terrace position would unacceptably erode the existing spaciousness in the Hamble Lane street scene and would be harmfully out of keeping with the existing development.

12. There is an existing two storey extension to No 110 directly opposite the appeal property and, therefore, it could be argued that the proposal would better balance the pair of facing terraces. However, it appears that this extension was permitted some time ago and pre-dates existing national and local policy, which places a particularly strong emphasis on high quality design and the importance of maintaining or enhancing local character. Moreover, it demonstrates the harmful effects of this form of extension due to its dominance in the street scene and unbalancing of the otherwise uniform character and appearance of the terraces. For these reasons, it should not be seen as a positive precedent for the appeal proposal.
13. Accordingly, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed two storey side extension 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 contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which promotes high quality design.

Appeal B

14. The proposed extension in this case would be single storey. It would be the same width as the extension in Appeal A, but due to its more limited built form and bulk it would not result in the same effects to the host dwelling or the terrace. However, while the existing dwelling has a dual-pitched roof with a gable end the extension would have a hipped roof form. As such, the later addition would not reflect the design of the host dwelling and would not integrate effectively with it. Moreover, due to the relative width of the extension, the width and consequential shallow pitch of the roof would further draw attention to its incongruous appearance against the host dwelling.
15. The extension would be prominent in the street scene due to its position next to the footpath and road frontage. From these views the contrast between the two roof forms would be particularly apparent. Furthermore, as the extension would be the same width as the proposal in Appeal A, it too would reduce the openness to the side of the dwelling and have similar, albeit not as significant, harmful effects with regard to the largely consistent building line and spacious aspect across the terraced dwellings.
16. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed single storey side extension would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Core Strategy and to the SPD, as described above. It is also contrary to the design provisions of the Framework.

² APP/M1595/D/15/3134341 dated 1 February 2016.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, both appeals should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR