



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2026

by **G Sylvester BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D1590/D/25/3375907

16 Woodside, Leigh-on-Sea, Southend-on-Sea, Essex SS9 4QU

- 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 Corinne Bray and Cllr Stephen Aylen against the decision of Southend-on-Sea City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01098/FULH.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension with balcony to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area.

Reasons

3. Woodside has a traditional suburban residential character and appearance that is derived in the most part from the long rows of two-storey houses and the occasional bungalow that are set back from the road on broadly consistent building lines. Although of different designs, proportions and materials, those buildings tend to share some common characteristics with the vast majority having traditional sloping pitched roofs.
4. Except for Numbers 5 to 17 Woodside, which are linked together as described later in this decision, the gaps between the upper floors and roofs of buildings in the rows are generally wider than at ground floor level. Whilst they are not of consistent widths, those gaps are sufficient in the main to avoid jarringly cramped relationships between buildings of different styles and forms in the rows.
5. The appeal property is one half of a pair of substantially similar semi-detached dwellings, and it has a side projecting single storey flat roofed garage with balustrading above. The space above the garage provides a gap of some 4 metres or so between the side wall of the appeal dwelling and that of Number 18 at upper floor level. That gap makes a positive contribution to the pattern of buildings in the street scene, including separating buildings of different styles from one another.
6. The proposed extension would bring the side wall of the host dwelling closer to that of Number 18 at first floor level, and its built form would substantially infill the gap that exists between them. The gap that would remain would be uncharacteristically narrow by comparison to nearly all existing gaps between

buildings in the street scene. As such, the proposed extension would have a cramped relationship with Number 18, that would be at odds with the pattern of development in the street scene.

7. Set at an elevated level close to the host dwelling's sloping roof and that of Number 18, the geometric shape of the proposed extension's flat roofed form would result in a visibly awkward blend of different roof forms. It would be visibly out of keeping with the traditional sloping roofs of the existing dwellings in the street scene. Although the existing garage has a flat roof, it is not visually comparable to the proposed extension as it joins the side wall of the appeal dwelling at a much lower ground floor level.
8. The front wall of the proposed extension would be set back behind that of the host dwelling as advised by the Council's Design and Townscape Guide document¹. However, for the reasons given above, the position of its front wall would be insufficient on its own to avoid conflict with the overarching guidance in paragraphs 351 and 352 of that document insofar as it requires development to respect the surrounding townscape.
9. The row of dwellings at Numbers 5 to 17 Woodside are connected by a rhythmic pattern of 2 storey flat roofed links that are set back behind their main front walls, with no gaps between them. In street level views they form a visually coherent group of similar style buildings that read as an architectural set piece quite unlike any others in the street scene. In its proposed extended form, the appeal proposal would not create a pattern of linked dwellings of comparable appearance. It follows that those buildings do not establish a visual context for the appeal development.
10. For those reasons I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, contrary to Policies CP4 and KP2 of the Southend on Sea Borough Council Core Strategy 2007, and Policies DM1 and DM3 of the Southend on Sea Borough Council Development Management Document 2015, insofar as they require well designed additions that successfully integrate with the original building and respect local context and the surrounding townscape, including having regard to the Council's Design and Townscape Guide.
11. There would also be conflict with paragraphs 135 and 139 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they require well designed development sympathetic to the surrounding townscape. The National Design Guide has limited relevance to my considerations in this instance as the Council has not identified which parts of it are relevant.

Other Matters

12. The Committee Report refers to local residents who support the proposal and others with no objection to it. For the reasons given above I do not share their views that the proposed extension would barely be noticeable or that it would match other buildings in the street scene. As such, those representations do not alter my conclusion on the main issue above.
13. Even if I were to agree with the Council that the proposal would have no detrimental effects on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, an absence

¹ Southend-on-Sea Supplementary Planning Document 1, Design and Townscape Guide 2009

of harm would not outweigh the harmful effects on the street scene and policy conflicts that I have identified above.

14. The concerns raised by the appellants over the proceedings at the planning committee meeting are a matter for the Council and they do not affect either the planning merits of the appeal or my consideration of it. Therefore, they have no bearing upon my decision.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area, sufficient to bring it into conflict with the development plan as a whole. The material considerations do not outweigh that conflict. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed.

G Sylvester

INSPECTOR