



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/25/3365706

50 Hathaway Road, Grays, Essex RM17 5LA

- 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 Kamaljit Singh against the decision of the Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01035/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "*erection of new dwelling to land rear of 50 Hathaway Road*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a 2-storey end of terrace house with a long garden to the rear. The house faces Hathaway Road, a pleasant tree-lined residential street comprising rendered terraced housing with small front gardens. The site is bounded to the side by Fairfax Road and by Dell Road to the rear. A fence has been installed to sub-divide the garden which includes an area of hardstanding at the rear with vehicular access from Fairfax Road. There is a gradual fall in the land from Dell Road to Hathaway Road.
4. Whilst Hathaway Road has a unified and relatively verdant appearance, Dell Road is dominated by blocks of flats and areas of hardstanding on one side. On the other side there are rear gardens of the Hathaway Road properties, many of which include an assortment of garages and outbuildings. The section of Dell Road close to the appeal site lacks coherence and creates an unwelcoming pedestrian environment.
5. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a 1-bedroom, 2-person bungalow within the rear part of the appeal site together with an off-street car parking space accessed directly from Dell Road. This would have a larger footprint than the host property but a reasonable degree of separation would be provided between the 2 dwellings. As such, and having regard to the outbuildings at the rears of nearby houses, I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in an overly cramped form of development or result in harm to the openness of the area.

6. The proposed dwelling would have a shallow-pitched zinc roof and the walls would comprise a mix of render and brick. It would present a blank façade to Fairfax Road and the Dell Road frontage would essentially comprise a brick wall and a car parking space. There would be very limited space for planting or the installation of a boundary treatment to create appropriate defensible space. In these respects the proposal would exacerbate the poor characteristics of this portion of Dell Road. Due to its siting, layout and design I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of its surroundings.
7. For these reasons the proposal is contrary to Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015). These policies require, amongst other things, that developments are of a high-quality design, must contribute positively to the character of the area, and must promote a continuity of street frontages. There is also conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.
8. The reason for refusal refers to Annexe A1.2(i) of the Local Plan 1997 which sets out minimum requirements for private amenity space. The Council notes that the proposal would achieve these standards but raises concerns about the effect of development within the gardens reducing the available amenity space over time. Were the proposal to be acceptable, this concern could be overcome by the imposition of a planning condition removing permitted development rights in respect of the erection of outbuildings within the rear gardens thereby retaining amenity space and an adequate level of openness between the 2 dwellings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR