
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2017

by J A B Gresty MA MRICS

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

Decision date: 09 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/17/3180242

15 Church Road, Fordham, Colchester, Essex CO6 3NA

- 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 Mr M Highfield against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 170791, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is the middle of three modestly sized bungalows situated in a row on the east side of Church Road. The bungalows are the last three dwellings on this side of the road before leaving the built area of this part of the village and there is farmland to the rear and south of the properties. The bungalow sits towards the centre of its plot with noticeable space to the sides of the bungalow. Whilst the appeal property's plot is not large, the space on each side of the bungalow and the dwelling's single-storey design contribute towards the property having a spacious character and appearance which is in keeping with the neighbouring properties and its location next to farmland.
4. The proposal is for extension and alteration of the bungalow to form a substantial two-storey dwelling with a significantly larger footprint than the bungalow. The extended dwelling would have large, tall, steeply pitched roofs with a prominent front facing gable to one side and a hipped roof to the other. The eaves of the front elevation of the hipped part of the roof would be about level with the top of the ground floor windows, contributing towards there being a very large expanse of roof which would be visible from the road. The size and style of the property's roofs would result in them dominating the appearance of the extended dwelling and would be unlike any other dwelling I saw nearby during my inspection.
5. The extended dwelling would be considerably larger than either of the neighbouring bungalows and it would dominate the appearance of the two

bungalows when viewed from the road and countryside behind. Also, due to its height and bulk, the extended dwelling would appear out of scale with its own plot, emphasising the size of the extended dwelling in relation to its immediate neighbours and other two-storey houses in the locality.

6. Whilst there are two-storey houses nearby on the other side of the Church Road and towards the centre of the village, because of its size, height and design, the extended dwelling would stand out in the local landscape as an unduly large, prominent and incongruous feature which would detract from the character and appearance of this part of the village and the adjoining countryside. In these respects the development would be contrary to the requirements of Policies DP1 and DP13 of the Colchester Borough Council Local Development Framework Development Policies and the general thrust of Policies SD1 and UR2 of the Colchester Borough Core Strategy.

Conclusion

7. At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and the Framework indicates that new development should respond to local character and should reflect the identity of its surroundings. In this case the extended dwelling would stand out in the local landscape as being out of keeping with its own plot and the neighbouring properties, resulting in significant harm to the character and appearance of this part of the built village and the adjoining countryside. Accordingly the appeal proposal would fail to represent sustainable development as sought by the Framework and, for the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J A B Gresty

INSPECTOR