
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by T Bennett BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/25/3372077

55 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 Mrs Raine Felton against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0366/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of rear conservatory and bay window with single storey extension and a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling in a spacious plot, set back from the road behind a driveway and the front building line of the neighbouring properties.
4. The street scene comprises an eclectic mix of dwelling styles including detached and semi-detached two-storey properties, chalet bungalows, and flats along with varied roof forms, with several properties featuring loft conversions incorporating flat and pitched roof dormers. This variety contributes to the character of the area.
5. The proposal includes a single-storey extension. No concerns were raised in relation to this on the decision notice. Given the modest scale of the extension and its location to the rear with limited visibility from public vantage points, I have no reason to come to an alternate view on this aspect of the proposal. The decision therefore is focussed on the loft extension.
6. The loft extension would extend the existing rear hipped roof into a gable and would include a side dormer. Given the variety of roofscapes and property styles in the vicinity, the principle of a side dormer would not be unacceptable. However, the ridge of the dormer would be level with the ridge of the host property and would have no setback from the eaves. Consequently, the dormer would appear as an unduly dominant and overly large addition to the roofscape of the host dwelling, particularly when viewed from the front elevation where the large size of the dormer would be most apparent.

7. Even considering the setback position of the property, the dormer would appear noticeably at odds with the other dormers in the street scene, which appear as subordinate additions due to their setback from the eaves and/or a set down from the ridge. This includes the examples highlighted by the appellant. The proposal would thus harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the area and would be in conflict with the Residential Design Guidance - Roof Development (2012) which supports dormers as long as they have substantial roof verges above, below and to the sides and do not appear dominant.
8. I acknowledge that the side dormer would incorporate Tudor detailing to match the front gable of the host dwelling, however this does not sufficiently mitigate against the harm identified.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene and would conflict with Saved Policy EC2 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (1998). This seeks a high standard of design in alterations to existing buildings and that are appropriate to its setting.

Other Matters

10. Whilst I recognise that the dormer has been designed to satisfy building regulations, I have limited substantive evidence to suggest that the proposed design is the only option for extending the property into the roof space. This is not therefore a matter that provides sufficient justification for allowing a poor design.
11. I note that no objections have been received. However, the lack of objections does not equate to a lack of harm and does not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

T Bennett

INSPECTOR