



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2025

by **F. Bradley BRP (NZ) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/25/3374891

5 Bristol Road, Southend-on-Sea SS2 6XA

- 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 Two Bridges Properties Ltd against the decision of the Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application ref is 25/00913/FULH.
 - The development proposed is described as “single-storey rear extension and the conversion of the existing loft, amended from a hip to gable roof with a rear dormer and rooflights, to create two additional bedrooms”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension and the conversion of the existing loft, amended from a hip to gable roof with a rear dormer and rooflights, to create two additional bedrooms at 5 Bristol Road, Southend-on-Sea SS2 6XA in accordance with the terms of the application, ref 25/00913/FULH, subject to the following three 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 drawing refs: 20220530 PL10 Revision A; 20220530 PL11 Revision A, 20220530 PL13 Revision C.
 - 3) The materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, development had commenced but had not been fully implemented. As such, I have considered the proposed development based on the description of development and the submitted plans.
3. The Design and Access Statement refers to the development including “the conversion of an existing outbuilding (outer house) into a gym and ancillary use space”. Neither the application form nor the appeal form refers to the use of the outbuilding, and the Council does not refer to it in their decision letter. I have determined the appeal based on the description of development as per the application form, which is set out above, and on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The site occupies a plot on the corner of Bristol Road and Willmott Road and contains a semi-detached house with an existing two-storey side extension with a hipped roof and existing single-storey and two-storey rear extensions. A single storey outbuilding is located to the rear of the site. The dwelling faces onto Bristol Road.
6. The surrounding area is residential in character and contains a mix of detached and semi-detached bungalows, chalet bungalows, and two storey semi-detached dwellings. The area is characterised by gaps between the pairs of dwellings and the dwellings being set back from the road frontage which creates a sense of spaciousness.
7. The proposal includes a single storey rear extension, a rear dormer, a hip to gable roof extension and rooflights. The single storey rear extension would be adjacent to an existing rear extension. The Council has raised no issue with the single storey rear extension, dormer or rooflights. I have no reason to reach a different view to the Council regarding those aspects of the development.
8. The hip to gable element of the proposal would be formed above the existing two-storey side extension. Due to the site being a corner plot, the development would be visible along Bristol Road and Willmott Road.
9. Although hipped roofs are the predominant roof form in the surrounding area, there are a number of properties on Bristol Road with varied roof forms, within the vicinity of the site. The chalet bungalows to the southeast of the site and the two-storey semi-detached dwelling at 16 Bristol Road have gable ends. The attached dwelling at 3 Bristol Road has a flat roofed two-storey side extension. The semi-detached chalet bungalows opposite the site have half-hipped roofs with one also having a front dormer. The semi-detached dwelling at 4 Willmott Road, also visible within the context of the site, has a gable end.
10. Although the site occupies a corner position and is consequently prominent within the streetscene, the proposal would be read in the context of the properties described above. In this setting, the proposed hip to gable extension would not appear visually intrusive or incongruous within the surrounding built form.
11. The proposed use of matching materials would assist in integrating the hip to gable extension with the existing roof form. As a result, the alteration would read as part of a cohesive roof and would not present as an unduly prominent or visually dominant feature within either the site or the wider streetscene.
12. The site and its semi-detached pair both have two-storey side extensions of differing roof forms. As such, the pair is not presently symmetrical. While the proposal would alter the appearance of the dwelling, the existing disparity between the extensions means that the development would not harm the established character or appearance of the area.

13. For the above reasons, the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area is acceptable. Accordingly, there is no conflict with policies DM1 and DM3 of the Council's Development Management Document and policies CP4 and KP2 of the Council's Core Strategy insofar as they seek to require all developments to respect and maintain the character and appearance of the site and its local context and surroundings.

Other Matters

14. Interested parties have raised concerns regarding the change of use of the property, including the outbuilding, and the potential impacts of such a change of use including increased activity, noise and disturbance. The development is for works to the existing dwelling only and no change of use is proposed as part of the application.
15. The Council has not identified any concerns in respect of overlooking or loss of privacy. However, several interested parties have expressed concerns regarding the potential for such effects, particularly in relation to the proposed rear dormer which would be positioned on the rear roof slope, facing towards the side elevation of the neighbouring bungalow at 5 Willmott Road. The dormer would sit approximately 20m from the appeal site's rear boundary. The side elevation of the bungalow contains windows and is located close to this boundary. A degree of overlooking already exists due to the existing first-floor rear windows of the appeal property. Any additional loss of privacy to the neighbouring property would be restricted by the presence of the boundary fence, the existing outbuilding, and the separation distance between the proposed dormer and the bungalow.
16. The dormer would give rise to only limited overlooking of the rear gardens of other adjacent neighbouring properties. Such effects would be constrained by the angle of the dormer with the adjoining dwelling at 3 Bristol Road and by the separation distances to other properties.
17. A window is proposed within the proposed gable end, adjacent to Willmott Road and would overlook the public highway. Accordingly, it would not result in any loss of privacy to adjacent properties.
18. Noise impacts and disturbance during construction have been raised as an issue by interested parties. Such impacts would be limited to the construction period only and, due to the scale and nature of the development, a condition restricting this would not be necessary or reasonable.
19. Concerns regarding highway safety impacts resulting from additional traffic and increased parking have been raised by interested parties. No objection was raised by the Council on highway safety grounds. I have no compelling reason to reach a different view to the Council regarding this aspect of the development.
20. Other issues raised by interested parties including loss of views, health and safety concerns, non-compliance with Building Regulations and impacts on property values are not planning considerations.

Conditions

21. The Council has suggested four conditions which I have considered against the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In the interests of certainty, conditions are necessary to set out the time limit for

development and to ensure the development is built in accordance with the submitted plans.

22. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is necessary to maintain the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.
23. I have not imposed the Council's suggested condition requiring the gable end window at second floor level to be obscure glazed and fixed shut. There is no need for this condition as the design of the window as proposed is acceptable and there are no neighbouring properties which would be directly overlooked.

Conclusion

24. The proposal accords with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
25. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

F. Bradley

INSPECTOR