



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/D/25/3370650

7 Langton Way, Chadwell St Mary, Thurrock RM16 4PP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Marcio Firmino against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00416/PHA.
 - The development proposed is rear extension with a depth of 6.00 metres from the original rear wall of the property, with a maximum height of 3.50 metres and eaves height of 3.00 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse subject to limitations and conditions.
3. Where an application is made for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for development which exceeds the limits in paragraph A.1(f) but is allowed by paragraph A.1(g) to Part 1, paragraph A.4(3) provides that the local planning authority may refuse the application where it considers that the proposed development does not comply with the conditions, limitations or restrictions that are applicable to such permitted development.
4. Paragraph A.4(7) to Part 1 requires the local planning authority to assess the impact of the proposed development on the amenity of all adjoining premises, taking into account any representations received.
5. The Council has cited development plan policies and supplementary planning guidance in their reason for refusal. However, the principle of the development is established by the GPDO, and the prior approval provision does not require regard to the development plan.

Background and Main Issues

6. An objection to the proposed development was received from the owner or occupier of an adjoining premises. As a result, the prior approval of the local planning authority was required.
7. The main issue is the impact of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with regard to outlook and light.

Reasons

8. No 7 Langton Way is a two-storey mid-terrace dwelling. It was clear from my site visit that the proposal would introduce a sizable single storey rear extension with a height to eaves of 3 metres (m), overall height of 3.5m and a projection of some 6m directly along the shared boundaries with No.5 and No.9. It is separated to the rear from neighbouring properties by high timber fencing.
9. Both neighbouring properties at No 5 and 9 have rear ground floor openings including windows and glazed patio doors. Whilst the application of the Council's 60-degree sightline, set out in the Thurrock Design Guide: Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD Adopted September 2017 (SPD) is disputed, it is likely that the proposal would result in some overshadowing leading to loss of light to these openings particularly in the daytime. given the orientation of the rear elevation of both properties, relative to the proposed extension, the impacts in terms of overshadowing and reduction in light would not be at all times. Nevertheless, by reason of its proposed height, extent of projection and proximity to shared boundaries the proposal would result in an adverse impact and causing harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
10. Furthermore, the height, when combined with the level of projection of the extension from the rear of the appeal property, would have a dominant and overbearing impact on the adjoining properties which would be imposing when viewed by neighbouring occupiers. This is exacerbated by the extension being positioned almost directly along the shared boundaries. In this regard it would be detrimental to the neighbouring occupiers living conditions in terms of outlook.
11. The appeal property currently benefits from a single storey extension. However, this is not comparable to that proposed in terms of scale, mass, height or proximity to the shared boundary.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regard to outlook and light. It would insofar as be relevant conflict with Policy PMD1 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework: Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development 2015, which requires that development proposals should not harm the amenity of existing or prospective users and residents. It would also be, insofar relevant, at odds with the guidance in SPD which requires extensions to not unacceptably reduce natural daylight and outlook to neighbouring properties.

Other Matters

13. The high-quality design and materials of construction do not justify a harmful development on amenity, and the extension would be limited in terms of respecting the area as it would only be seen in views from the rear of the property. Nevertheless, my considerations in the appeal are limited to the provisions of the GPDO.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons give, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Gee

INSPECTOR