



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: 8 February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/23/3329850

13 Triumph Close, Chafford Hundred, Grays, Thurrock RM16 6RQ

- 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 Marius Kadzys against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00463/HHA, dated 18 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension at 13 Triumph Close, Chafford Hundred, Grays, Thurrock RM16 6RQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00463/HHA, dated 18 April 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Preliminary Matters

2. Revised versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have 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 Council raises concern that the proposed plans that support the planning application illustrate the creation of habitable living space in the roof space and the garage. The description of the proposed works provided on the planning application form describes the proposal as the erection of a two storey side extension. For clarity I have limited my consideration of the proposed development to that for which planning permission is sought, that is, the erection of a two storey side extension.

Main Issue

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 surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is of the same design and layout as adjacent properties, numbers 10 and 11 Triumph Close, and there are other examples of repetitive design within the Close. That said, there are also other properties of differing design. There are also other properties within Triumph Close that host gable sides, however, those are not situated on such a visually prominent site. The proposed development would occupy a corner siting and would be a clearly visible development within the street scene for this reason.
6. Although the side extension would be constructed close to the side boundary of the site it would be set back some distance from the front building line of the host property and have a lower ridge height to that of the original dwelling. Furthermore, it would be of lesser width to that of the host dwelling even when discounting the width of the garage. The extension would also replicate the design of the host property.
7. Taking these factors collectively, the proposed side extension would have a subservient appearance to that of the host dwelling. As such, it would not be of an overall bulk and mass that would represent a visually dominant addition to the dwelling. There is some repetitive character to the appearance of the Triumph Close street scene but there is also variety to the house types within the Close. The side extension would be a clearly visible addition to this property and within the street scene. Nonetheless, I do not consider the proposed extension to the dwelling would cause visual harm to the host property or would represent a visually dominant feature out of keeping within the context of the street scene.
8. 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, PMD1 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.
9. The Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017 requires extensions or alterations to respond positively to the character of the main original dwelling such that its character is maintained and to respect the context of the street scene. The proposal would comply with these aims.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and subject to the conditions listed, this appeal should be allowed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR