



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/25/3365331

74 Laburnum Drive, Corringham, SS17 7QF

- 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 Denise Andrews against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01330/HHA.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on (1) the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area; and (2) the living conditions of occupants of 76 Laburnum Drive (No.76), with particular reference to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house in a group of properties set around a central green. Although not identical, these dwellings appear as a cohesive group as a result of the simplicity of the repeated house types and detailing. The rear of the appeal property is visible in gaps between buildings in Giffords Cross Avenue to the south-west, and from a private parking area accessed from that road.
4. Although the proposal would have a lower ridge height than the main house, this would be created by a reasonably slack, double-pitched roof that would be out of keeping with the simple form of the main house. By spanning the full width of the property, it would appear as an overly large addition that would not respect the scale and proportions of the existing building.
5. Part of the proposal would be visible through the gap between 72 Laburnum Drive (No.72) and the appeal property, but the incongruous roof form and scale would be more apparent when viewed from the rear parking area and from Giffords Cross Avenue. Whilst other rear extensions are visible in the street scene, these appear to be more modest in width and more reflective of the design and size of the properties to which they relate.
6. The appellant advises that the proposed roof form seeks to copy that built at No.72, an adjacent end-terrace house. It has a double-pitched roof extending closer to its roof ridge than the proposal, and is visible from the access road and parking area.

However, whilst I have not been provided with details of the planning permission granted for that extension, it appears to be more modest in width at first-floor level than the proposal, with part being single-storey. Moreover, it relates to a house with a different plan and roof form. I note the appellant's view that the scale and mass of the appeal proposal is less than built at No.72, but no details have been provided of the relative floorspace and volume. However, viewed on the ground, there are material differences between the two schemes, and the development at No.72 would not justify approval of the appeal proposal.

7. I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and its surroundings, and would not demonstrate high quality design founded on a thorough understanding of, and positive response to, the local context, as required by CSPMD¹ Policy CSTP22; nor contribute positively to the character of the area, in conflict with Policy PMD2 of that document, and supporting design guidance in the Council's published RAE².

Living Conditions

8. As shown on the submitted plans, the proposed extension would overhang the shared boundary with the attached property, No.76. The appellant advises that this is to better facilitate a future extension at No. 76, and an undated letter from occupiers of that property confirmed agreement to an extension of the party wall, in order that it could be used "if" No.76 were to be extended in the future. There is no indication in the appeal documents that planning permission for such an extension has been sought by the owners of No.76, or granted.
9. Due to its height and depth, its siting at the shared boundary, and the proximity to windows of habitable rooms, the proposal would result in an unacceptable degree of visual intrusion for occupants of No.76. It would create an oppressive sense of enclosure that would be exacerbated by its orientation, with the rear of the properties facing north-west. This would conflict with technical guidance aimed at minimising the impact on neighbouring residents set out in section 4.2 of the Council's adopted RAE.
10. I note the letter from the occupiers of No.76, but there can be no guarantees that any extension to that property would be built, nor about what form it would take. As occupants and their circumstances change over time, it is appropriate to secure by design reasonable living conditions for all users. As such, I have taken into account the current relationship of buildings in assessing the effect of the proposal.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would diminish the outlook for occupants of No.76 to a degree that living conditions would be harmed, contrary to CSPMD Policy PMD1 and the RAE.

Other Matters

12. The submitted plans show that the appeal development would encroach the shared boundary with No.76. As such, all of the land needed to facilitate the proposal has not been included in the red edged application site. The submitted ownership certificate also indicates that all of the land is within the appellant's ownership. Procedurally, the submitted letter from the occupants of No.76 would not address

¹ Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) 2015

² Thurrock Design Guide Residential Alterations & Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017

these anomalies. Whilst this would have been an issue had I found the development to be acceptable, it has not prevented me from considering the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR