



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: 05 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/25/3372547

7 Leigh Park Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea SS9 2DU

- 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 Ms M Chung against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00755/FULH.
 - The development proposed is attic accommodation including new glazing to front bay gable & relocate rooflight. Form new rear dormer. Replacement front door-set.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the new glazing to the front bay gable. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the relocated rooflight, the formation of a new rear dormer and replacement front door-set and planning permission is granted for a relocated rooflight, the formation of a new rear dormer and a replacement front door-set at 7 Leigh Park Road, Leigh-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea SS9 2DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00755/FULH, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: 2502 TP-01.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the Leigh Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house with a part lower ground floor. It presents as 'Arts and Crafts' in its style and architectural expression and sits in a group of similarly designed properties that are either contemporary with it or adopt the arts and crafts style as a later pastiche. These sit on a steep incline on the North side of the street and are located in the middle of the CA, the

significance of which lies in the development of the town, over an extended period, as a seaside resort.

4. The appeal dwelling forms part of the late Edwardian development of larger houses in the town, and the appeal dwelling is recognised in the Leigh Conservation Area Appraisal as making a positive contribution to the significance of the CA. The CA is a heritage asset to which I have a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
5. The proposal is for the alteration and extension of the appeal dwelling, including a loft conversion to create additional living space. This would involve the addition of a dormer window to the rear roof slope and the insertion of windows into the currently blind expressed gable on the front elevation.
6. The proposed rear dormer would be designed as a contemporary rather than traditional addition to the rear of the house but would accord with the Arts and Crafts idiom prevalent in this part of the street and CA. The change of door set would be more traditional in design and would not be at odds with the design and period of the appeal dwelling. The relocation of the roof light would be a minimal change with negligible effect on the character and appearance of the house.
7. As such these elements of the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling or that of the local area, or to the contribution that it makes to the significance of the CA. These elements of the proposed development would not therefore be in conflict with Policies KP2 and CP4 of the Southend-on-Sea Core Strategy (2007) (the CS), Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the Southend-on-Sea Development Management Document (2015) (the DMD). Collectively these seek development 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, conserves existing historic and architectural character and townscape value.
8. The insertion of windows into the blind expressed gable at the front of the property would, follow the form of the timber expressed in the design of the existing dormer, but would, however, fundamentally result in the dormer appearing as fully glazed. This would be an alteration that has no direct design precedent in the group of Edwardian Arts and Craft houses of which it forms part and would not reflect the design idiom of the original house.
9. Whilst it is acknowledged that that there have been small vertical windows inserted into the expressed gables at 11 and 13 Leigh Park Road, these are small insertions that do not reflect or complement the Arts and Crafts design of their hosts but do retain the vast majority of the original blind gable. As such, these do not form a precedent for the insertion of the larger windows into the gable of the appeal dwelling.
10. The insertion of the windows into the gable would alter a feature that it shares with other houses in the group, which, although exhibiting many accrued alterations, retains their original architectural expression and group cohesion. As such, the proposed insertion of windows would result in the appeal dwelling appearing incongruous in relation to the other houses in the group.

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties in the local area that have had either windows inserted into an original gable or elevation. These however vary from the design of the appeal dwelling and of the proposed windows and do not appear to be direct exemplars for the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable. Further, these other properties do not appear to sit within a group of buildings that demonstrate a collective design idiom or cohesion. The insertion of windows into these properties would have been considered on their own merits at the time of their approval, and I have done likewise in my consideration of the proposal, which is a main tenet of the planning system. I have, therefore, only accorded these only minimal weight in my considerations.
12. As such, I find that the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable would, detract from the architectural cohesion that currently exists between the group of Edwardian Arts and Crafts properties, despite existing alterations. This weakening of architectural cohesion would be apparent in views of the group from the street and would result in the appeal dwelling not making such a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the local area or to preserve the character or appearance of the CA, to the detriment of its significance as a heritage asset.
13. As such, I find that the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable would not accord with the design guidance set out in Southend-on-Sea Design and Townscape Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2009). This guidance is intended to achieve developments that are influenced by and influence their context positively, do not destroy existing character and that draw references from their host building and integrate better with the existing building.
14. For these reasons, I find that the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and that of the local area as well and the significance of the CA. This would be contrary to Policies, KP2 and CP4 of the CS and Policies DM1, DM3 and DM5 of the DMD.
15. I find that the harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling of the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable would be moderate and the harm to the character and appearance of the CA would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of those heritage assets. The proposal would increase the living space of the appeal dwelling, which is primarily a private benefit in this instance and no substantive public benefits have been brought to my attention. I must give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA and, in addition, moderate weight to the effects on the character and appearance of the appeal property. I consider that these benefits could be achieved without the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable and do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Other Matters

16. A neighbour had concerns over whether the proposed rear dormer would lead to a loss of privacy though overlooking of their garden and property. However, although the proposal would add to the existing locations that provide opportunities for overlooking of neighbouring properties, this would not be any more intrusive than that possible from the existing rear windows of the appeal

dwelling and would to be of a level to be expected in a developed residential area of this type.

Conclusion and Conditions

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the relocated rooflight, the formation of a new rear dormer and replacement front door-set. However, in relation to the proposed new glazing to the front bay gable the appeal should be dismissed.
18. In respect of the proposed relocated rooflight, the formation of a new rear dormer and replacement front door-set, I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. To ensure design quality I have also added a condition concerning the use of matching materials.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR