



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2023

**by David Smith BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 March 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/22/3308198**

**6 Woolings Row, Baker Street, Orsett, RM16 3AS**

- 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 Miss Amritpal Sagoo against the decision of Thurrock Council.
  - The application Ref 22/00699/HHA, dated 16 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2022.
  - The development proposed is a double storey rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issues

2. These are:
  - Whether the proposed extension would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and, if so, whether other considerations clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt, and any other harm, so as to amount to very special circumstances; and
  - The effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Woolings Close with particular reference to visual impact, overshadowing and privacy.

## Reasons

### *Green Belt*

3. Policy PMD6 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development 2015 indicates that permission will only be granted for new development in the Green Belt provided certain requirements are met. Extensions to buildings must not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. This reflects the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, for residential extensions this means that they should be no larger than two reasonably sized rooms or any equivalent amount. This was explained by the Inspector who dismissed an appeal for a two-storey side extension at the property last year<sup>1</sup>.
4. The Council's undisputed calculations are that the habitable floorspace of the original building is 92 sq m and that the extension would have a floorspace of almost 39 sq m. This would represent an increase of over 42% and would exceed the figure given for the two reasonably sized rooms allowance. An addition of this size would be approaching half of the floorspace of the original

---

<sup>1</sup> Ref: APP/M1595/D/20/3258911

dwelling and, on this basis, would be disproportionate. Therefore, having regard to the provisions of Policy PMD6 and the Framework, the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

5. Nevertheless, in the context of a fairly recent estate of 24 houses, the proposed extension would not conflict with any of the Green Belt purposes listed in the Framework and the reduction in openness would be insignificant.

#### *Living conditions*

6. The proposed extension would be close to the side boundary of 7 Woolings Close. The appellant highlights the rear projection at 5 Woolings Row but the side-by-side juxtaposition of Nos 4 and 5 is quite different to the angled relationship between the appeal property and No 7. Because of this and the presence of the existing dwelling, the proposal would not lead to an overbearing visual impact or to a significant curtailment of sunlight. However, the two first floor bedroom windows would afford views directly down into the rear garden of No 7 and this would result in a serious loss of privacy.
7. Therefore, the proposal would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 7 Woolings Close due to the significant overlooking that would occur. As a result, it would conflict with Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development which indicates that development will not be permitted where it would cause unacceptable effects on the amenity of others.

#### **Other Considerations**

8. The appellant has not directly addressed the reason for refusal relating to the Green Belt or put forward any other considerations in support of the proposal. Nevertheless, the extension would clearly be beneficial in increasing the amount of available living accommodation at the property.
9. The design of the proposed addition would be in keeping with other houses within the group as it would feature a gable end roof and use complementary materials. Indeed, there are similar projections to many of the other dwellings at Woolings Row and in Woolings Close. However, achieving well-designed places is an expectation of all development and so this aspect of the scheme does not count positively in its favour.

#### **Conclusion**

10. The proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. In accordance with the Framework, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. The proposed extension would also harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers. Other considerations provide little support for the proposal. These do not, therefore, clearly outweigh the totality of harm and so very special circumstances do not exist.
11. The proposed extension would not accord with the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

*David Smith*

INSPECTOR