



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by **H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/25/3366619

35 Templewood Road, Hadleigh, Benfleet, Essex, SS7 2RJ

- 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 Paul Williams against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0257/FUL.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached chalet-style dwelling with front and rear dormer windows. It is set within a mixed street scene, with dwellings which range in terms of design and form, and many of which have been extended.
4. The proposed rear extension would be set in from both side roof eaves. Due to the reasonably narrow gap between the appeal property and the neighbouring house, No.37, the depth of the extension means that it would be glimpsed from the front, but would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.
5. Nevertheless, the proposal would materially add to the massing and bulk of the dwelling at roof level. It would appear as a disproportionately deep projection from the main roof, and its double-pitched design would not respect the architectural style of the host dwelling. I do not share the appellants' view that the design would appear balanced, being awkwardly set off to one side of a shallower section of retained flat-roofed dormer, and around the lower gable. I appreciate that its set back position means that the flat-roofed element would not be highly visible, but it would contribute to a disjointed appearance.
6. Due to its siting, the visual impact would largely be confined to views from neighbouring gardens, but Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Local Plan 1998 (LP) has a requirement to secure a high standard of design which is appropriate to its setting, and which does not harm the character of its surroundings. The rear of the

property may be less sensitive than the front, but the proposal would nevertheless undermine the overall cohesion and appearance of the property. I am mindful that no surrounding residents objected to the proposal, but the views of individual residents are only one aspect of the decision-making process.

7. In support of its policies, RDG7 of the Castle Point 'Residential Design Guidance' Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (RDG) advises that the roof design of any development should be compatible primarily with the dwelling, but should also be informed by the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of roof development. Despite the mix of designs in the area, none appear to support the complex design and 'top heavy' form proposed in this case. In particular, RDG7 requires a roof extension to be proportionate to the remainder of the dwelling, and this would not be achieved with the provision of what would be a deeply projecting first-floor extension to a dwelling with single-storey roof eaves.
8. The proposal would provide a pitched roof to the remaining area of an existing flat-roofed extension. However, being single-storey, this element does not detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling, and the proposed pitched roof would not offer a benefit to justify the scale of the development above.
9. I appreciate that this appeal follows a previously refused application, and sought to address concerns regarding the extent of a flat roof and projection from the main roof. Whilst I note these amendments, for the reasons outlined above the proposal would result in its own harm to the dwelling. The suggestion of widening the first-floor windows and 'notching' the gable roof below does not form part of the appeal scheme, but in any event these changes would not resolve the issue of scale, nor fundamentally change the mismatched design to the host house.
10. The appellants refer to a refused application at 29 Templewood Road, a building of very different design and form to the appeal property. However, in the absence of fuller details of that development I cannot make a comparison with the appeal proposal, and it therefore offers limited weight to the appeal.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property, and in so doing, its surroundings, contrary to LP Policy EC2 and guidance in the RDG. It would not accord with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires developments to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment.
12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR