



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **P Burley BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/W/25/3369669

290 Prince Avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea SS0 0NF

- 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 Gowsihan Nallathambi against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00256/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'external roller shutters (retrospective)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that the development which is the subject of this appeal has already taken place, that it appears to accord with the plans before me and, therefore, I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Local planning policy seeks to ensure that new development is designed so that it adds to the overall quality of the area and respects the character of the site, its local context and surroundings. In addition, the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) (DTG) specifically states that solid and micro-perforation shutters will not be considered acceptable because they have a detrimental effect on the townscape, creating dead frontages, attracting graffiti and preventing internal surveillance of the building.
5. The appeal site occupies a prominent location on a street corner that is visible from a busy arterial road. Nearby land uses are generally residential. Although the solid black roller shutters are intended for use overnight, the shutter boxes which project approximately 25cm from the host building are visible at all times.
6. Whilst the bay windows of properties nearby project forward of the building line, these are an integral part of the original design of those properties rather than a subsequent addition like the shutter boxes which project from the host building. Similarly, the presence of domestic garage doors at 270-274 Prince Avenue does not lend support to the appeal scheme as these generally do not give rise to the

issues that the DTG is seeking to avoid. Although the appellant has also referred to there being other solid shutters in the local area, I did not see any when I undertook my site visit.

7. Whilst roller shutters on commercial premises might not be unusual, they are not a characteristic of the area within which the appeal site is located. Furthermore, even if they were painted a different colour as suggested by the appellant, this would not address the dead frontages that they would result in when closed which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although it has been argued that shutters of this design, installed on the front and side elevations, are needed to ensure the security of the commercial premises, I have not been presented with any evidence to demonstrate why less impactful alternatives, such as grilles which retain visibility into the window as noted in the DTG, would not provide a satisfactory degree of security or that the solid shutters are needed to address a specific issue or risk.
9. The appellant has also referred me to a planning permission that was granted in 2002 for the retention of a roller shutter on the side of the appeal premises. The officer report provided by the appellant refers to a single roller shutter and I have not been provided with any drawings or photographs which illustrate where that shutter was positioned or which allow me to appreciate its impact on the character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, the policies referred to in the officer report have since been superseded and I have not been provided with any details of the policies against which the 2002 application was determined to allow me to gauge any similarities or differences between them and the policies against which I must determine the appeal scheme.
10. I conclude that the solid roller shutters and the associated shutter boxes have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the site, the street scene and the wider area because they are incongruous additions to the host building and because they create dead frontages when closed. Therefore, the appeal scheme conflicts 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) and with the Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide (2009) which together seek high-quality development that makes a positive contribution to the character of the original building and respects the character of the existing neighbourhood. Overall, therefore, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh that conflict.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Burley

INSPECTOR