



---

## 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: 12<sup>th</sup> December 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M1595/W/25/3361971**

**6 Southend Road, Thurrock, Grays RM17 5NH**

- 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 Harmeet Singh of Harmonay Estates against the decision of Thurrock Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 24/01034/FUL.
  - The development proposed is described as, 'demolition of existing garage and new dwelling to the land rear of 6 and 8 Southend Road Grays'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the address and Appellant name from the application form in the banner heading above in the interests of certainty.

### Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
  - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area;
  - whether the proposal would provide a suitable living environment for future occupiers with regard to private amenity space;
  - the effect of the proposal on highway safety; and
  - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers at No 8 Southend Road (No 8) with regard to privacy.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The site lies near the junction of Southend Road and College Avenue. Southend Road is predominantly occupied by retail and commercial uses such that it has a commercial character. College Avenue is a residential street with mostly two storey semi-detached and detached properties in a traditional style with some larger flatted developments. Generally, the properties follow a linear pattern of development with long rear gardens. Other developments such as at College Close opposite the site, depart from the prevailing pattern of development but retain a spacious quality. Therefore, the area surrounding the site has a pleasant spacious and varied residential character.

5. As the site fronts College Avenue and is located adjacent to No 2 College Avenue, it has a closer relationship with the spacious residential character of this road than with Southend Road.
6. The proposed dwelling would be 2 storeys tall and detached with private amenity space to the side of the building. The proposed private amenity space would be significantly smaller than that of most of the surrounding properties, resulting in a departure from the prevailing spacious pattern of development. The siting of the private amenity space to the side of the building would result in space between the proposed building and the building at No 6 Southend Road. However, as the proposed dwelling would appear overly large compared to the size of the plot, the scheme would harmfully diminish the spacious character of the area.
7. The adjacent buildings are semi-detached and have a wider massing and appearance than the proposed building. However, the semi-detached buildings have gable features and bay windows that break down the width of the massing. The proposal would have a similar width as the surrounding individual dwellings and would therefore not appear incongruous with the character of the area in this particular respect.
8. The proposed roof would be pitched with the narrower hipped side facing College Avenue. The triangular appearance of the roof when viewed from College Avenue would not appear discordant given the gable features at roof level present on the adjacent buildings. The proposed fenestration would feature larger panels of glazing than the surrounding properties. However, the proportions would not be significantly different to the fenestration in surrounding properties.
9. Accordingly, the roof and fenestration would appear different to that of the adjacent buildings, however the style and proportions would be similar such that the proposal would not appear discordant in the street scene. In addition, the proposed materials could be secured via a suitably worded condition.
10. However, the proposed dwelling would appear excessively large compared with the private amenity space and unacceptably diminish the spacious character of the area.
11. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies CSTP22, CSTP23 and PMD2 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, a high standard of design and proposals that protect, manage and contribute positively to the local context and character.

### *Living environment*

12. The proposed private amenity space would fall significantly short of the requirements set out in Annexe A1 of the Thurrock Borough Local Plan Adopted September 1997. While the proposed area may be greater than a previous application, I have necessarily assessed the scheme before me. I note the evidence regarding a scheme at 40 First Avenue for a 3 bedroom dwelling. However, further details are not before me to enable a direct comparison to be made with this appeal.

13. The proposed 3 bedroom dwelling is likely to be occupied by a small family. The proposed private amenity space, as well as falling significantly short of the requirements, would not comfortably accommodate a range of family activities such as outdoor dining area, space for a washing line and children's play equipment as well as circulation space. Although the site is in an urban location, this would not override the harm to the living conditions of future occupiers that would result from the proposal.
14. Consequently, the proposal would not provide a suitable living environment for future occupiers with regard to private amenity space. Therefore, it would conflict with CS Policy PMD1 which seeks, among other things, developments that is likely to cause unacceptable effects on the amenity of future occupiers of the site.

### *Highway Safety*

15. The proposal includes the provision of 2 off-street parking spaces. As well as 2 parking spaces for the new dwelling, the Council has identified a requirement of 3 parking spaces for the existing commercial unit and the dwelling at No 8.
16. From the submitted drawings, the existing site is occupied by a single garage and space in front of the garage for vehicles. It therefore currently appears to provide 3 parking spaces for the retail and residential units on Southend Road which would not be accommodated as part of the proposal.
17. There is limited on-street parking provision on Southend Road and College Avenue such that the shortfall of parking spaces would be likely to result in obstructive or dangerous parking.
18. The Appellant has suggested that the rear of No 6 could be used to accommodate 3 parking spaces. However, no drawings are before me to demonstrate that this could be implemented safely. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to demonstrate that the proposal could accommodate 3 more off-street parking spaces, a condition would not mitigate the risk to highway safety that would result from the proposal.
19. Consequently, the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Therefore, it would conflict with CS Policy PMD2 and PMD8 which seeks easy and safe access and adequate parking.

### *Living conditions*

20. The ground floor and private amenity area of No 8 lies adjacent to the site. The first floor windows of the proposal would be full height and would look towards No 8. The distance from the proposed windows to the ground floor of No 8 would be moderate such that the scheme would not result in an undue effect on privacy of the occupiers of the internal spaces serving No 8.
21. The scheme would also result in views towards the private amenity space of No 8. However, views to the area closest to the rear elevation would be some distance such that the privacy of occupiers would not be unduly affected. There may be views to the rear of the private amenity space that could be restricted through the use of conditions relating to landscaping and boundary treatments. Therefore, the scheme would not result in an unacceptable effect on the privacy of users of the garden.

22. Consequently, the proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupiers at No 8 with regard to privacy. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with CS Policy PMD1 which seeks, among other things, development that would not cause an unacceptable effect on the amenities of others.

### **Other Matters**

23. The proposal would contribute a dwelling to the local housing supply. Given the limited scale of development and my findings above, this matter has not altered my overall decision.
24. I note that the proposal would be located within the Zone of Influence for the Thames Estuary and Marshes Special Protection Area and RAMSAR. Had I found that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of area, the living environment of future occupiers and on highway safety I would have found it necessary to investigate this matter in greater detail as part of my appropriate assessment. However, in the circumstances of this case this has not proved to be a determinative matter given the harm that would arise from the development.

### **Conclusion**

25. 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.

*R Sabu*

INSPECTOR