



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2024

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/23/3334334

7 Milton Road, Grays, Thurrock RM17 5EZ

- 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 Olufemi Alaran against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01178/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear of garden annexe to the main house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey terraced dwelling with a garden to the rear. Development in the area generally fronts the roads with narrow gardens to the rear. Outbuildings are typically positioned towards the rear of gardens, adjacent to the informal service roads. The outbuildings are primarily small in scale and cover a limited proportion of the gardens and have flat roofs with a variety of material finishes.
4. The proposal is for a single-storey annexe associated with the dwelling at No 7 Milton Road. The position of the building to the rear of the site would reflect the pattern of development to the rear of properties in the area. While the building would be of a similar height to the nearby outbuildings, it would be considerably larger in form. The building would extend towards the host dwelling and would cover a substantial proportion of the external area of the site.
5. The flat roof would limit the overall height of the building. Nonetheless it would be visible from neighbouring properties and the service roads. Due to the considerable depth of the building, the development would be a disproportionate addition to the area. The building would dominate the rear garden and would detract from the character of the dwelling and the area. In addition, the significant depth of the building would reduce the usable garden space at the site, emphasising its excessive scale.

6. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies CSTP22 and PMD2 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015), which collectively require proposals to demonstrate high quality design and contribute positively to the character of the area. It would also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure that development add to the overall quality of the area and are visually attractive as a result of good architecture.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has suggested that an outbuilding accommodating a family room/gym of similar proportions could be erected using permitted development rights and would have a similar effect to the proposal. However, I have not been presented with any substantive details, including a Certificate of Lawfulness, to demonstrate that there is a realistic prospect that such a development would take place.
8. Moreover, permission is sought for an annexe and not an outbuilding incidental to the use of the dwellinghouse. Therefore, I cannot be certain that the effects from permitted development would be comparable to those of the appeal proposal. Accordingly, this matter does not indicate that the proposal's impacts should be accepted.

Conclusion

9. The proposal conflicts with the development plan. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR