



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/D/25/3368391

22 Medlar Road, Grays RM17 6TU

- 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 and Mrs Atoyebi against the decision of the Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00447/HHA.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single-storey side and rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single-storey side and rear extensions at 22 Medlar Road, Grays RM17 6TU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00447/HHA, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 003 Proposed Block Plan; 004 Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 005 Existing and Proposed Roof Plan; 006 Existing and Proposed Elevations; 007 Existing and Proposed Sections; 008 Parking Block Plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Medlar Road, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a detached garage to the side. There is pergola structure to the rear immediately next to the tall timber fence shared with the attached neighbouring house, 24 Medlar Road. The property is situated in a suburban residential estate comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached houses of similar age and appearance, many of which have rear extensions.

4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a single-storey addition that would wrap-around the side and rear of the house linking it to the garage and projecting into the garden. Due to the stepped relationship between the appeal property and No. 24, the proposal would result in a substantial length of flank wall along the shared boundary.
5. There are 2 glazed ground floor apertures in the rear elevation of No. 24. The one closest to the appeal property is a glazed door which the information before me indicates serves a kitchen which has a large window facing the street. Whilst the proposal would reduce outlook via the glazed door I am satisfied that the existence of the street-facing window would ensure that this room maintains an adequate level of outlook overall.
6. The second aperture comprises a set of patio doors. The information before me suggests these provide the main source of outlook from the living area. As these patio doors are a significant distance from the boundary shared with appeal property I am satisfied that adequate outlook from this room would be maintained with the appeal proposal in place.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 24. It therefore accords with Policy PMD1 of the Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (2015), which outlines, amongst other things, that developments will not be permitted where they would cause, or likely cause, unacceptable effects on amenity. The proposal also accords with the aims of the Thurrock Residential Alterations and Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017).

Conditions

8. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a materials condition is required to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR