



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 July 2023

**by C Carpenter BA MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 7 September 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/23/3314092**

**58 Brentwood Road, Chadwell St Mary RM16 4JP**

- 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 Sherriff against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 22/01462/FUL, dated 28 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 December 2022.
  - The development proposed is a detached garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
  - i. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area.
  - ii. The effect of the proposed access arrangement on highway safety.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

3. 58 Brentwood Road is at the end of a group of four two-storey terraced houses. They have long, narrow gardens, some of which include modest outbuildings at the far end. The dwellings are surrounded by a low-rise housing estate and its extensive, open grounds. There are several public footpaths crossing these grounds, including one from Brentwood Road that runs along the side of No 58 and the boundary of its garden.
4. The proposed detached garage with separate storeroom would be similar in depth to the host dwelling. This depth would not in itself be too great given the proposal's subservient height and the overall length of the garden. However, the proposed siting of the garage behind an external parking space means it would be much closer to the host dwelling than the outbuildings associated with the other three houses in the group. Altogether a substantial proportion of the garden would be lost. This would give the appearance of much greater depth to the proposal, particularly given its high visibility from the nearby footpath and public realm. Consequently, the development would appear to dominate the existing house, which would detract from its character and that of the surrounding area.
5. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building and

surrounding area. This is contrary to Policies PMD2 and CSTP22 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (TCSPMD) and the Thurrock Design Guide Residential Extensions & Alterations Supplementary Planning Document. These policies, and associated guidance, promote high quality design and require proposals to contribute positively to the character of the area. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) where it seeks development that is sympathetic to local character.

### *Highway safety*

6. There is an unmade, overgrown access route down the opposite side of the four houses from No 58. This leads to a communal area behind the ends of the gardens and existing outbuildings, which is also overgrown and unkempt. I am satisfied this route would be wide enough in principle to allow a car to enter and exit the proposed garage and external parking space. However, its poor state of repair is likely to deter many drivers, who may look for alternative parking spaces on the roadside or at the front of the house. These would not be safe places to park given the proximity of a pedestrian crossing. In addition, people using the proposed external parking space without access to the garage would need to walk up and down the unlit and uneven access route to and from Brentwood Road. This would not be safe for pedestrians, particularly after dark.
7. I agree a lockable garage would be safer in principle than parking on the road, particularly given the care needs of the residents who occupy No 58. Regular use of the side and rear access may also help to prevent rubbish being dumped there. However, these arguments add to the safety concerns I have identified above, rather than outweighing them. The risks to highway safety would need to be mitigated before regular use of the access and garage occurred, and no such proposal is before me.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposed access arrangement would have a harmful effect on highway safety. This is contrary to Policy PMD8 of the (TCSPMD), which requires vehicle parking provision to be safe and of high-quality design, reducing the risk of inappropriate on-street parking. It is also contrary to the Framework where it resists development with an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### **Conclusion**

9. I have found the proposal conflicts with the development plan, read as a whole. No other material considerations, including the Framework, have been shown to indicate that a decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*C Carpenter*

INSPECTOR