



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/25/3366597

56 Woodfield Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS9 1ER

- 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 Mrs Melanie Larke against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00076/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension with mezzanine level. Installation of 2 rooflights to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey mid-terrace house with small front garden. The street and local area are primarily made up of houses of similar scale, that exhibit an unspoilt early 20th century architectural expression, with many surviving original features. To the rear of the appeal dwelling is an existing two storey outshoot, with a gable roof that hips to the rear roof slope of the main house.
4. The proposal is for an extension that would extend the first floor sideways towards the boundary of the appeal dwelling with its attached neighbour at 58 Woodfield Road (No.58) but would be set slightly away from the boundary. To allow for the proposed mezzanine floor level, the height of the first floor level of the outshoot would increase significantly. The roof of the proposed extension would also be mono-pitch in form, in tiles to match those of the existing roof of the house. This proposed roof would reach to just over half the height of the existing roof of the house at its tallest point, falling in height towards the boundary with No.58.
5. The proposed extension would result in the first floor of the outshoot projecting sideways out over its existing ground floor and towards No.58, which would result in a jettied appearance. The proposal is for the extension to be clad in a dark tone of vertical plank cladding with vertical strip windows, close to the rear corner of the proposed extension that would be nearest to No.58.

6. The jettied form of the effect of the proposal and its tall mono-pitch roof reaching to over halfway up the existing rear roof slope of the appeal dwelling would not reflect the existing and original architectural expression of the appeal dwelling. Rather the form and design of the proposal, including cladding and window arrangement, would result in it appearing as a mid-20th century/Contemporary design addition. This would stand in stark and incongruous contrast to that of the appeal dwelling.
7. Given the scale of the proposal and the height and extents of its mono-pitch roof form, the proposal would be prominent in views of the appeal dwelling from the rear of surrounding properties and their gardens, as well as appearing more distantly in views from Upland Road of the rear of the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part. Whilst there are other rear extensions, including rear roof dormers evident on other properties in the immediate and wider local area that are visible from the rear of the appeal dwelling, these appear to be of a subordinate scale, and in a more traditional and complimentary design idiom that reflects that of their host dwellings.
8. In this context the views of the appeal dwelling, more particularly from the rear of surrounding properties, the scale of the proposal and its mono-pitch roof, would result in it appearing as an unsympathetic and uncharacteristic addition to the terrace and to the streetscene as a whole, having a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the local area.
9. Given the detriment effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area I have identified above, the proposal would not accord with the aims of the design guidance given in the National Design Guide (2021) and the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2009). Collectively this guidance is intended to achieve developments, including by extension, that are influenced by and influence their context positively, do not destroy existing character and that draw references from their host building, appear subservient and integrate better with the existing building, with roof styles and pitches that integrate old and new.
10. The appellant has drawn my attention to other existing first floor extensions and two storey outshoots in the local area. However, these outshoots do not have mono-pitched roofs as stated, but rather they individually form half of a pitched roof with its attached pair on the rear of the neighbouring property. The example provided by the appellant of a mono-pitched roof is that of a single storey rear extension that is attached to the flank of a neighbouring two storey outshoot. I have given this little weight in my considerations, as this varies significantly from the appeal proposal in form, design, height and context, and it would have been considered on its own individual merits, and I have done likewise with the proposal.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would result in substantial harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part and moderate harm to the character and appearance of the local area. This would not accord with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007), Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015). Collectively these seek development, including by that of extension, which is of good quality design that respects the character of the

site and original building, is informed by local context and respects the character of the existing neighbourhood.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR