



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2019 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons)

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/19/3237597

37 Brook Hall Road, Fingringhoe, CO5 7DG

- 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's Martin Harrison and Peter J Martin against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 190970, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a refurbished front porch, garage conversion and two single storey side extensions, refurbishment and modernisation throughout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The description of the proposed development has been taken from the appeal form rather than the application form as it is considered that this description is more succinct.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling that forms part of a distinct group of four similarly designed dwellings. Notwithstanding the diversity in housing styles in the wider context, they display a strong architectural consistency and are proportionate in scale. They therefore have a unified and positive influence on this part of the street scene. The proposal would include the construction of two single storey side extensions, one smaller extension to the rear of the porch and another larger extension incorporating the garage conversion on the other side of the property.
6. The smaller side extension and the refurbished porch would be modest in size, proportionate to the dwelling and unobtrusive. These elements of the scheme

are therefore acceptable. However, the larger extension to the east side would, by reason of its height and width, substantially increase the scale of built development to the front and side of the dwelling. In particular, the width of the extension would be comparable with the existing dwelling resulting in a disproportionately wide frontage. Together with the added height and mass of the pitch gable roof, the proposal would be a visually dominant form of development out of scale and character with the existing dwelling. Although the appeal property is on the end, because of its strong visual correlation with the group, the effect of the extension would be to fundamentally alter the appearance of the existing dwelling and disrupt the pleasing visual rhythm of the group. Even though the site is in a fairly rural and remote location, the proposal would still be visible within the streetscene and therefore, due to its dominance and overly large appearance when compared with the host dwelling, it would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

7. There are some trees and hedging to the front of the property which would provide some screening. However the scale of the proposed development would still be visible through the foliage and from the entrance to the dwelling. Furthermore, the future retention of the trees and hedging in their present form cannot be guaranteed.
8. The appellants have highlighted a property to the rear of the appeal site which appears to have two-storey side extensions either side of the dwelling. However this is in a different setting to the appeal property and has no bearing on the individual context of the appeal proposal which I have determined on its own merits. It is also noted that no public objections have been received, however this does not outweigh the identified harm.
9. For the reasons above the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policy DP1 of the Local Development Framework Development Policies (2010) and Policy UR2 of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2008) which seek to promote a high quality of design with development which respects and enhances the character of the site. It would also conflict with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusions and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR