



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/23/3330920

89 Erriff Drive, South Ockendon, Thurrock RM15 5AZ

- 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 Amy I S & Peter Smith against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00930/HHA, dated 25 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension with pitched roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension with pitched roof at 89 Erriff Drive, South Ockendon, Thurrock RM15 5AZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00930/HHA, dated 25 July 2023, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the planning application was determined by the Council. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my decision.
3. The description of the proposed development provided on the planning application form indicates that the development has already taken place. Therefore, I was able to view the side extension at the time of my visit.

Main Issues

4. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. The host property forms part of a row of terraced properties where there is uniformity to their rhythm and appearance. To the south are a row of two storey terraced dwellings that front onto Hamble Lane. To the north are end gables of residential terraces that run at right angle to Hamble Lane.
6. The proposal widens the footprint of the property bringing increased built development closer to Hamble Lane. The extension is visible in the Erriff Drive street scene and above the close boarded fence that runs along the boundary of Hamble Lane. There is an openness to the area at the end of Erriff Drive and Hamble Lane with Oakwood woodlands running alongside Hamble Lane.

7. To some extent the extension would change the uniformity and symmetry of the existing terrace. Notwithstanding this, although not set back from the front building line, the extension, being single storey, is a subordinate extension to the host dwelling. It would not significantly alter the appearance of the existing terrace or substantially visually undermine its original appearance and form.
8. The terrace to the south hosts a uniformity to the building line along Hamble Lane. However, the gable ends of terraces give a more staggered appearance to the Hamble Lane street scene when looking north. There is also separation between the extension and the site boundary at Hamble Lane with the extension hosting a hipped gable roof form. I do not consider the proposal to be unduly prominent at the end of the terrace or would significantly undermine the openness to the character and appearance of the area. Being single storey and of limited width with hipped gable roof it would not substantially obstruct views of the terrace to the south.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015 and the provisions of the Framework. These policies and the Framework seek, amongst other matters, development to be of high quality design and to consider the sensitivity of the site and its surroundings.
10. The Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017 requires extensions or alterations to respond positively to the character of the main original dwelling and to respect the context of the street scene. The proposal would comply with these aims.
11. The Council refers to two appeal decisions at 96 Hamble Lane that related to proposals for a 2 storey side extension and a single storey side extension. From the description of that development provided in the officer's report the design of the single storey side extension would differ to that of this development. It is advised that the Inspector found 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 and made reference to width and its impact on openness. I do not have the full details of that proposed development to assess what similarity it may have to that of the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this, I have found the proposal before me to be acceptable for those reasons set out above.
12. The proposal has been made in retrospect and the Council have accepted this to be the case. The Council have indicated on the appeal questionnaire form no wish for conditions to be imposed. Given the development has taken place the imposition of any planning conditions would not be necessary in this case.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR