



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: 25th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/25/3368121

1 Oak Road, Grays, Thurrock RM17 6JX

- 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 Kashif Bhatti against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00029/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of two-storey side extension to form a new 2-bed dwellinghouse. Erection of ground and first floor rear extension and rear dormer window.
-

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 relates to a two-storey, end-terrace dwelling situated on a larger corner plot at the junction of Oak Road with Grove Road. Whilst there is some variety to the pattern of development within the surrounding area the prevailing character is that of two-storey terraced dwellings with bay windows, which provide a strong degree of uniformity in the built form. Dwellings which occupy corner plot locations have generally retained their more generous plot sizes, often set back from the highway, providing an open feel which contributes positively to the area.
4. The proposed dwelling would be sited on the side garden of No 1 Oak Road. Its front elevation would be notably set back from the front elevation of the terrace, and its ridge height would be significantly lower than other properties in the immediate streetscene. These elements would be at odds with the consistent front alignment of the terrace in which the proposal lies. Furthermore, due to the limited width of the plot fronting Oak Road the proposed dwelling would be significantly narrower than those nearby. Consequently, the proposed dwelling would be an incongruous addition to the streetscene that would be highly visible, exacerbated by the site's exposed and prominent corner location.
5. The juxtaposition of the varying roof profiles would be visible in the wider streetscene and would represent an incohesive built form. Although single storey, the proposed flat roof would be more prominent within the streetscene than the existing due to its increased size and position close to the site's side boundary. Nevertheless, I do not concur that this would be overbearing.

6. Owing to the alignment of the plot's western boundary the proposal would not directly abut the boundary for its entire length, with an area of garden remaining. Nevertheless, for the reasons stated, I find that the proposed dwelling would appear contrived and would not sit comfortably within the spacious character of the corner plot, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellant advances that the proposed dwelling would be similar to other development within the surrounding area, akin to a side extension. It is recognised that the proposal has been designed to appear subordinate to No 1, and that it is not uncommon for there to be extensions to properties in the locality. Nevertheless, its form, scale and character as a separate dwelling, including its own garden and parking, would not be read as an ancillary addition to No 1. The proposed development would be read as an independent dwelling and on this basis would be out of character with the prevailing pattern of development.
8. My attention has been drawn to nearby developments, including Nos 14, 54, 101 and 103 Grove Road and No 1 Maple Road whereby the appellant states that these developments directly abut the pavement with either no relief to the side, or provide little relief. I do not know the background to those developments. However, from the limited information available to me, and as observed at my site visit, I do not consider the developments to be comparable. In particular, some appear to be the original built form and where such development relates to extensions, they are not directly comparable to an additional dwelling as is proposed in this case. In any event, I have assessed the appeal on its own merits, and the presence of other development does not justify the harms which I have identified that the appeal proposal would cause.
9. The external finish of the proposed development could be conditioned if I were to allow the appeal. However, this would not sufficiently mitigate the harm I have identified.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. As such, conflict arises with Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 of the adopted Thurrock Core Strategy and Policies for the Management of Development (as amended) 2015 insofar as they seek high quality design that reinforces a positive sense of place. The proposal would also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character, and which adds to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

11. Owing to its design and orientation the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers of adjacent dwellings with regards to overlooking or loss of light. I am satisfied that the proposal would provide for satisfactory outdoor amenity space for the proposed and retained dwelling and refuse and cycle parking facilities. The proposal would also not give rise to highway safety concerns. However, these are neutral matters.
12. The appellant submits that the dormer window to the existing property could be carried out under permitted development, presumably under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. Limited information, such as details of the appearance, have been provided to demonstrate that it would comply with the provisions. In any event the dormer forms part of the

description of development, and consequently, this does not outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

13. The Framework seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing and promote the efficient use of land. The provision of a new dwelling in an accessible residential area therefore weighs in favour of the appeal and would contribute to meeting housing needs in the area.
14. There would be some social and economic benefits arising from the proposed development, including in supporting employment during construction and the bringing of trade to nearby services and facilities upon occupation. However, these benefits and the contribution to housing supply in the borough would inevitably be limited given the limited scale and nature of the development. These matters do not, therefore, outweigh the harm that has been identified and do not lead me to an alternative conclusion.
15. The appeal site is located within the recognised 'Zone of Influence' (Zol) for one, or more, of the European designated sites scoped into the Essex Coast Recreational Disturbance Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (RAMS). These protected sites are primarily designated for endangered or vulnerable populations of seabirds, which often overwinter or breed at these sites, as well as the wider coastal ecosystems and functions that support these and other populations (for example, plants and invertebrates).
16. New housing development within the Zol would be likely to increase the number of recreational visitors to these sites. While the effect of the appeal scheme is likely to be limited, in combination with other developments there is a risk of significant effects on the designated sites. The Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 require the Competent Authority to consider whether the proposal could adversely affect the integrity of the protected site, either alone or in combination with other developments. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other substantive reasons, it is not necessary for me to further consider the implications of the proposal for the Habitats site.
17. I note the evolution of the proposal from a previously refused scheme. However, I have considered the appeal proposal on its own merits, based on the evidence before me.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, which would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it.
19. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Gee

INSPECTOR