The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 April 2017

by Timothy C King (BA Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 4th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/17/3167858
4 Marram Close, Stanway, Colchester, CO3 0PJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Lynn Green against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
- The application Ref 162988, dated 23 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2017.
- The development proposed is *'Single storey front extension (resubmission of application 162489)'*

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 4 Marram Close, Stanway, Colchester, CO3 0PJ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 162988 dated 23 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Nos. 866-1C, 866-2, 866-3, 866-4A and 866-5A.

    3) The materials used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the development's effect on the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and also its surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a small, two-storey, gable-ended dwelling of post-war age. Simple in form and of functional design the dwelling fronts an access driveway which also serves Nos 5 and 6 Marram Close; two residential properties beyond. The proposal is for the erection of a front extension which, due to the constraints of the dwelling's front facade, would need to be positioned centrally so as to retain both the lounge and kitchen's front windows. The extension's roof would pitch into the dwelling's frontage, just

below first floor cill height and would project forward some 1.8m, roughly to the point of No 5's garden wall which abuts the access drive.

4. The immediate area shows a rather eclectic mix of house styles, and most noticeably No 7, a wide-fronted dwelling with a two-storey front projection which, given its size and distinctive form, appears somewhat anomalous in its design. Its flank wall lies adjacent to the drive and directly opposite the appeal dwelling's frontage.

5. From the street it can be seen that No 6, sited some distance back, has a porch extension off its flank wall. The proposed front extension, due to the proximity of No 4 to the main stretch of Marram Close, would be more readily visible, although its flank wall and repositioned front door would face towards the street.

6. The aims of Policy DP1 of the Colchester Borough Development Policies (DP) in terms of achieving high quality design for new development which should also be appropriate to the particular contextual setting is reflected in the wider aims of Policy UR2 of the Council's Core Strategy (CS). More specifically, DP Policy DP13 seeks to ensure that alterations to dwellings enhance the character of the original dwelling and do not significantly alter their size. In the contextual setting which I have described I am not convinced that the proposal would impact significantly on the general streetscene.

7. I consider that the main effect would be on the dwelling itself but, even so, whilst the extension would be a prominent addition thereto I do not consider its size would be disproportionate to the dwelling. Further, I am unclear as to the meaning of the Council's wording within its refusal reason that the extension would compete with and detract from other features that make a pleasant composition at present. It is perhaps difficult to justify the proposal in terms of it enhancing the character of the dwelling, but the extension's gabled roof would reflect the dwelling's general form and its size would not be significantly altered as a result.

8. In the circumstances I conclude that the proposal would be neither harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling nor its surroundings and there would be no material conflict with the general aims of CS Policy UR2, DP Policies DP1 and DP13 nor relevant advice within the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. For the above reasons and, having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal succeeds. In terms of conditions, to ensure a satisfactory appearance I impose a requirement that the extension be built using external materials to match that of the existing dwelling. Also, in the interests of certainty, I impose a condition requiring that the development be built in accordance with the approved plans.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR