



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2024 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/24/3347420

52 Cullen Square, South Ockendon, Thurrock RM15 6AB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martynas Vencevicius against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00176/HHA.
 - The development is described as '(Retrospective) 8 brick pillars on driveway'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 8 brick pillars on driveway at 52 Cullen Square, South Ockendon, Thurrock, RM15 6AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00176/HHA and the plans numbered 2117-02, 2117-03, 2117-05.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The initial planning application was made retrospectively. I observed that the constructed development was in accordance with the plans submitted and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. In the header and decision above I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form, as it describes the development more concisely. I have also omitted the word 'retrospective' from the decision as it does not describe an act of development.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site, a fully rendered corner-plot dwelling, is situated next to a country park and is at the end of a terrace of houses with brick exteriors. Across Cullen Square, the boundary treatments vary in height and style, with many low walls present.

7. The eight brick pillars are similar in height to boundary treatments around several other dwellings in Cullen Square. Furthermore, I observed some dwellings in the surrounding area have similar style lower walls with railings infilling the space between the pillars, that were comparable to the development in height. This meant they have a greater visual impact than the appeal development, where the gaps between pillars are not filled in. From the park adjacent the appeal site, the development is no more visible than the comparable examples in the street scene, particularly 43 Cullen Square, which likewise is immediately next to the road and a grass verge.
8. I also noted that the appeal dwelling stands out and somewhat dominates the street scene as a result of the fully rendered exterior, which sets it apart visually in a street consisting of mostly brick houses. The appeal site therefore already appears different to the local vernacular in the street scene. In this context, the addition of the wall and its eight brick pillars does not contribute to the incongruity or dominance of the site.
9. Furthermore, the appeal site has a similar style of wall at the rear, also along the boundary with the park. When observed from the public realm, this complements the front boundary treatment and appears cohesive and congruous across the site, demonstrating sympathy and respect for the surrounding built environment. For these reasons therefore, the scale, height, and design of the appeal development is not incongruous or at odds with the character and appearance of the area.
10. In conclusion, the development does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and therefore complies with Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015) which require sensitive and high-quality design and Thurrock Design Guide Residential Alterations & Extensions SPD (2017) 5.7.1 which promotes respect for the character of the area.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested conditions relating to implementation, complying with the approved plans and materials, however these are not necessary as the development has already been undertaken.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is allowed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR