



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

**by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5<sup>th</sup> December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/25/3372383**

**74A High Street, Aveley, South Ockendon RM15 4BX**

- 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 N Balachandran against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01017/FUL.
  - The development proposed is described as, 'alterations to facades and additional level to 74 high street over existing first floor flats to create two number self contained 2 bed 3 person flats'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. In the interests of certainty, I have used the address from the appeal form in the banner heading above.
3. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (Act) requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting. I have therefore had regard to this statutory duty in my assessment of the appeal.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II listed Crown and Anchor Hotel (Hotel); and
  - the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

### Reasons

#### *Setting of the Hotel*

5. The Grade II listed Hotel has its origins as a 15<sup>th</sup> century timber framed house with later alterations and extensions. As such, its significance, insofar as it relates to this appeal, lies in its historic form and the evidence of historic architectural details.
6. The appeal building lies on the opposite side of the road and can be seen in views of the Hotel particularly from the west. Accordingly, the site lies within the setting of the Hotel.
7. The Hotel and appeal site lie on High Street which is a commercial road predominantly characterised by buildings of varying types and ages that are

generally two storeys tall. Accordingly, the setting of the Hotel has a varied and spacious character and appearance.

8. The appeal building is currently two storeys in height, in keeping with the height of the surrounding buildings including the Hotel. Given the range of forms and materials of the buildings in the vicinity, the existing building is in harmony with the character of the area. Accordingly, it provides a neutral contribution to the character of the area and therefore the setting of the Hotel.
9. The proposed additional floor would significantly increase the height of the existing building. Given the flat roof design, and minimal setback of the front façade from the lower floors, the resulting massing of the proposal would appear dominant when viewed with the listed building.
10. I note the distance between the two buildings. However, the properties can be seen together from a number of views, particularly from the west. As such, the increased massing would visually dominate the listed building, drawing the eye away from the Hotel and its historic form including chimneys. The proposal would therefore erode the setting of the heritage asset and diminish its significance.
11. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
12. The harm with respect to the proposal would be at the lower end of the less-than-substantial category, given the limited scale of the proposal. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the Framework this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
13. The scheme would contribute 2 dwellings to the local housing supply. Given the limited number of dwellings proposed, I attribute limited weight to this benefit. The refurbishment of the existing flats would be a private benefit for the occupiers. However, even if this was considered a public benefit, the number of flats would be modest and attract limited weight in favour of the scheme.
14. Therefore, given the great weight that must be given to the conservation of heritage assets, the public benefits of the proposals do not outweigh the harm to the setting of the Grade II listed Hotel.
15. While I note the pre-application correspondence provided by the Council regarding this matter, I have necessarily assessed the scheme before me based on its planning merits.
16. Consequently, the proposal would harm the setting and significance of the Grade II listed Hotel. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy CSTP24 of the Thurrock Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies for Management of Development (as amended) Adopted January 2015 (CS) which seeks, among other things, development that will preserve or enhance the historic environment.

#### *Highway safety*

17. The submitted drawings include 4 parking spaces at the rear of the site. The submitted 'Transfer of part of registered titles' document sets out the rights granted

for the benefit of the property and include the exclusive right to park 3 rather than 4 motor vehicles on the parking spaces.

18. The parking spaces is noted in the document as being an area at the rear of the site. The title plans appear to indicate that the Appellant has right of way over the accessway which provides access to the area at the rear of the site including the parking spaces. In any event, land rights and ownership is not a planning matter. Accordingly, I see no reason why a condition restricting the occupation of the development until the proposed parking is provided, could not adequately deal with the matter.
19. Consequently, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Therefore, it would not conflict with CS Policies PMD2, PMD8 and PMD9 which together seek, among other things, proposals that allow safe and easy access, reduce the risk of inappropriate on-street parking and that road safety is not prejudiced.

### **Other Matters**

20. I note concerns regarding the service provided by the Council. However, I have necessarily assessed the scheme based on its planning merits.
21. I acknowledge local concerns regarding the proposed staircase that would provide access to one of the proposed flats, as well as noise and privacy with respect to adjacent flats. Given my findings above, these matters have not altered my overall decision.

### **Conclusion**

22. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

*RSabu*

INSPECTOR