



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: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/D/25/3372792

1 Pooles Lane, Hullbridge, Hockley, Essex SS5 6PA

- 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 Dave Prosser against the decision of Rochford District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00350/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension for annex.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey side extension for annex at 1 Pooles Lane, Hullbridge, Hockley, Essex SS5 6PA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00350/FUL, 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: 4227-04.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the address of the appeal dwelling varies in completeness between documents submitted, I have used that from the appellant's statement as this is a fully complete address with post code.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end of terrace house with a gabled end flank and front porch entrance, with a relatively extensive gravel parking area to its front and side. The terrace of which it forms part is made of houses of the same design, and that fundamentally retain their original form, but that appear to have all undergone varying degrees of relatively superficial alteration to the front but with

other more extensive alteration and extension to the rear. This results in a cohesive appearance to the street frontage of the terrace, which contributes to the quality of the streetscape of the area and its character and appearance, which is otherwise made up of a variety of dwelling types of differing scale.

5. The proposal is for a two storey extension to the flank of the appeal dwelling, which would be the same height as the appeal dwelling, replicating the height and form of the existing hipped roof form with gabled flank end. The width of the proposal would be just over half that of the original house. To the rear, the first floor level would align with the original rear wall of the appeal dwelling, and at ground level it would project further rearward to amalgamate with the existing single storey rear extension.
6. The design of the appeal proposal varies from the design of the previously dismissed appeal¹ proposal, in that it has a single dormer window to the front roof slope, rather than two small dormers as previously proposed. This single dormer would replicate the design and scale of the two existing dormers to the front of the appeal dwelling and the other houses in the terrace. The positioning and spacing of this dormer in relation to the two existing dormers would also replicate the distance and relationship between the existing dormer windows at the appeal dwelling and those on the roofs of other houses in the terrace.
7. The windows in the proposal would also replicate, the design, scale and alignment of the existing fenestration pattern of the original house. The front entrance of the proposed extension, which would be used as an annexe to the appeal dwelling, is designed to reflect the design of the front porch of the appeal dwelling and those of other houses in the terrace. However, although it would project to the same extent, it would be narrower and shorter than these existing porches and would appear noticeably more diminutive and secondary in scale.
8. Due to the replication of the design of the houses in the terrace, as detailed above, I find that the proposal would appear as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part and would extend and maintain the rhythm of the terrace. This replication of the existing design of houses in the terrace, including at roof level, would be complementary to the existing terrace, maintaining its harmonious appearance and the contribution that this makes to the quality of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the local area.
9. As such, the proposal would fundamentally overcome the reasons for dismissal of the appeal for the previous proposal for a similar extension and would accord with the design advice set out in the Rochford District Council Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2 (2027), which seeks to ensure that extensions are harmonious in character, scale, form and materials with the existing dwelling and have an acceptable relationship with adjacent properties and have an acceptable visual impact in terms of the street scene.
10. For these reasons, the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area. As such, it would accord with Policy CP1 of the Rochford Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM1 of the Rochford District Council Development Management Plan (2014). Collectively these seek, amongst other matters, development that is of

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/B1550/A/05/1187267

high quality design, promotes the character of the locality and have a positive relationship with nearby buildings.

Conditions

11. 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

12. The appeal is allowed

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR