



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/D/25/3372228

166 Southend Road, Wickford, Essex SS11 8EH

- 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 & Mrs Ford against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00633/FULL.
 - The development proposed is a detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a detached garage at 166 Southend Road, Wickford, Essex SS11 8EH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00633/FULL, 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 plan: 42/24/A (Rev 2).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house with gravelled drive to the front garden, with vehicle gates to its flank side that allow for vehicle access to further parking to the side and rear of the house and to an existing garage in the bottom of the rear garden. Planning permission¹ has previously been granted for an extant permission for a new garage to replace the existing garage. The approval for the replacement would position it further forward in the garden than existing.
4. The proposed garage would be the same design as that previously approved and would also replace the existing garage but would be positioned substantially further forward than that previously approved. It would also be positioned 0.3 metres further from the boundary fence than the 0.2 metres previously approved. The proposal would have a pitched roof terminating at 3.8 metres in height to its ridge and would be

¹ Planning Ref: 24/00518/FULL

only slightly taller to the eaves than the existing boundary fence. The front and garden elevations would be rendered, with brick elevations to the rear and to the flank, which would be set in approximately 0.5 metres from the approximately 2.1 metre tall boundary fence with the neighbouring house at 168 Southend Road (No.168).

5. The proposed position of the garage would result in it being adjacent to the windowless flank of the rear flat roofed extension to No.168, which appears to be approximately 3 metres tall and set in by approximately 1 metres from the boundary with the appeal dwelling. The flank of the proposal that would be adjacent to the boundary fence would be approximately 8.7 metres in length and would overlap with the flank wall of the rear extension at No.168 by over 3 metres.
6. The tallest point of the proposed garage would be 3.8 metres at the ridge of its pitched roof, which would not be adjacent to the boundary with No.168. The height of the eaves of the proposal nearest to the boundary fence would appear to be only slightly taller than this fence and would be set in 0.5 metres from it. This would appear to replicate the degree of enclosure from garden buildings, structures and boundary fences and hedges to rear gardens evident in the immediate local area.
7. The orientation of the proposal would result in its front, facing due north, which would result in any shadow onto the property at No.168 being only in the afternoon. Given the height to the eaves and the pitched roof of the proposal this would be in the late afternoon and would only be a marginal increase in shadow in late afternoon in the winter months.
8. In views from the rear rooms and garden of this neighbouring property, the proposal would appear to replicate the relationships between other garden buildings, structures and fences in surrounding gardens and neighbouring properties. As such I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant enclosing effect on No.168, and certainly not to the extent that it would be experienced as oppressive by its occupiers.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal would not result in harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such, it would not be in conflict with Saved Policy BAS BE12 of the Basildon District Local Plan Saved Policies (2007) and Paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development does not cause harm through over-dominance or overshadowing to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

10. Along with the standard condition regarding the timing of implementation, in the interests of good design I have attached conditions requiring compliance with approved plans and matching materials.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR