



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: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M1520/D/25/3372570

32 Mornington Crescent, Hadleigh, Benfleet, Essex SS7 2HP

- 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 Jamie Woolgar against the decision of Castle Point Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0429/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front, rear and side extension.
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 4 November 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front, rear and side extension at 32 Mornington Crescent, Hadleigh, Benfleet, Essex SS7 2HP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/0429/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 plans: 012 Rev A and 013 Rev C.
 - 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.
 - 4) No development above ground level shall take place until details of the parking space and landscaping of the front garden are submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority and have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on:
 - The character and appearance of the local area; and
 - Highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey semi-detached house with a hipped roof and a flat roofed rear ground floor extension. The main entrance to the house is located on the flank elevation. The house is located in a street predominantly made up of semi-detached houses and bungalows but with some detached properties. These all have relatively shallow front gardens with parking spaces.
4. The houses and bungalows on the street demonstrate a mixture of low key but traditional architectural expressions and are of similar scale. The majority of houses in the street show some form of alteration or extension to the front and rear and the overall streetscape is varied with little visual cohesion, presenting a very familiar suburban scene.
5. The proposal is for a single storey rear, side and front extension that would integrate with the existing rear extension. This existing extension is set to the rear of the original house but is offset towards the boundary with 30 Mornington Crescent with a gap to the boundary of approximately 0.56 Metres. The proposed side and front element of the proposed extension would have the same gap to the boundary in plan, but this gap would be narrower at its roof level due to the deep eaves of the proposed flat roof form. The proposal wraps around the front of the house to create a new front entrance that would project approximately 1 metre from the existing front wall.
6. The adjoining semi-detached property to the appeal dwelling features a two-storey side and front wraparound extension, which has resulted in the main entrance being relocated from the flank to the front elevation. This extension largely occupies the original side area up to the boundary with 36 Mornington Crescent, leaving an approximate side space of 0.8 metres to the boundary. The widths of side spaces between properties along this street and in the local vicinity demonstrate considerable variation: some retain very narrow original separations, while in other cases single-storey extensions and attached garages have been constructed directly adjacent to or on the boundary line.
7. The design advice given in the Castle Point Borough Council Residential Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD) generally recommends a side space of a minimum of 1 metre to the boundary. However, it also recognises that the amount of space should be informed by context. In this instance, varying widths of side spaces between properties create a diverse rhythm in the streetscape.
8. Combined with differences in dwelling types and architectural styles, this results in a streetscape with limited cohesion, where the size of the side space has minimal influence on the area's overall character and appearance. Therefore, the proposed 0.56 metre side space to the boundary would be consistent with the character and appearance of the local area. In this regard, I find that the proposal accords with the design advice given in the SPD.

Highway Safety

9. The wrapping side and front extension element of the proposal would infill much of the side space and would project forward by 1 metre. This would reduce the space

available for parking a car on the existing hard standing, and, in particular, would reduce the distance between the proposal and the highway. From my site visit and measurements taken, this would be reduced to less than the 5 Metres required for a straight on off street parking space of the type proposed. A larger parked car would therefore potentially overhang the footway, presenting a risk to pedestrians.

10. As part of their appeal statement the appellant has however presented an indicative plan that shows that there would be space to the front of the property to park a car if it was at an angle. This would duplicate the parking arrangement at its semi-detached pair, where car parking is at an angle due to the forward projection of the two storey extension at this neighbouring property.
11. The appellant has suggested that a condition is attached that would allow for such an arrangement on the appeal site. Having checked the dimensions on site, it would appear that such an angled parking arrangement, without any footway overhang, could be accommodated in the front garden. This would result in a parking space that would not present a risk to the safety of pedestrians using the adjacent footway and would accord with the design guidance set out in the SPD and Essex County Council's Parking Standards Design and Good Practice (2009). (EEC Parking Standards)
12. The attachment of a suitably worded condition requiring the submission and approval of details to accommodate such a parking arrangement would make an otherwise unacceptable development acceptable. This would also be necessary and reasonable and such a condition would meet the requirements for the attachment of conditions set out in Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).
13. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area or to highway safety. As such, it would not be in conflict with Saved Policies EC2 and TY8 of the Castle Point Borough Council Local Plan (1998). These collectively seek development that, is of a high standard of design, accords with EEC Parking Standards and that does not harm the character of its surroundings.

Conditions

14. 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. In the interests of highway safety, I have also attached a condition requiring the submission and approval of details of a parking space and associated landscaping in the front garden.

Conclusion

15. The appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR