



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/25/3373081

1 Tasker Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex RM16 4QS

- 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 Victor Grigoriev against the decision of Thurrock Council.
 - The application ref. Is 25/00528/HHA.
 - The development proposed is for an outbuilding and erection of a single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the outbuilding. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate and planning permission is granted for the single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate at 1 Tasker Road, Chadwell St Mary, Essex RM16 4QS in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 25/00528/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: location plan, 00, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. For the reasons that follow, I find the single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate to be acceptable as they are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the outbuilding that also forms part of the scheme. Therefore I intend to issue a split decision in this instance and grant planning permission for the single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounds.

Reasons

4. The appeal site consists of an end-terrace house, prominently located on the junction of Tasker Road and Wokindon Road. The street scene is broadly characterised by dwellings of similar scale, external materials and detailing. I observed that the layout of the terrace immediately to the north of the appeal site running along Tasker Road is fairly regimented. The front building line of the units is laid out in a well-defined linear pattern along the highway, with space for gardens or parking between the facades and the public footpath.

5. The outbuilding the subject of this appeal is in place, and interrupts this pattern. It projects into the front/side garden of the appeal site and beyond the established building line that predominates along this side of Tasker Road. Furthermore, it is of substantial proportions, with the elevations and flat roof exceeding the height of the front boundary treatment, thus exacerbating its dominance. The proximity to the adjacent brick wall means that there is no space for planting to soften or screen the development. It is clearly evident from the public domain within the vicinity of the site, and results in a prominent, harsh incursion within the context of the neighbourhood.
6. I acknowledge that an acceptable amount of garden area would be retained for the occupants of the residence, and the outbuilding is sufficiently separated from the host unit and Wokindon Road. However, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above. I also recognise that there may be instances elsewhere in the vicinity of outbuildings in front/side gardens. However, in my view these should not be seen as a benchmark for the future development of such areas, or encourage proposals that are detrimental to a streetscene through unsympathetic scale and location.
7. The Council does not object to the single storey front extension or the new boundary wall with gate, and I have no reason to disagree. They would appear to respect the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality and would not have adverse impacts in respect of living conditions or access and parking.
8. I therefore conclude that whilst the single storey front extension or the new boundary wall with gate are acceptable, the outbuilding is detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounds. It contravenes Policies PMD2, CSTP22 and CSTP23 of the Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development 2015 and the Council's Residential Alterations and Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2017, which require schemes to respond to and respect the character of the area and to provide a high quality of design. It would also be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development.

Conditions

9. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty. A condition requiring external materials to match those used on the existing building would provide for a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey front extension and new boundary wall with gate, but dismissed insofar as it relates to the outbuilding.

C Hall

INSPECTOR