
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/20/3255154

Lower Lufkins, Bargate Lane, Dedham, CO7 6BN

- 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 Clarke against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 200526, dated 26 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have also dealt with another appeal (APP/A1530/D/20/3249352) on this site. That appeal is the subject of a separate decision.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application, however there is a dispute between the parties as to whether the extension is on the rear elevation. It is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the development comprises a single storey extension and therefore I shall deal with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area, having particular regard to the location of the site close to the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

Character and appearance - building

5. The appeal site comprises a detached house with an unusual two storey design with a diamond shaped feature and brick detailing and a white string course on three sides. The dwelling is positioned between Bargate Lane and open fields.
6. The Council has previously granted planning permission for the extension of the existing appeal building. These permissions, currently being implemented, have sought to ensure that the buildings character and appearance were retained and that the consequent effect upon the surrounding area was acceptable. At the time of my visit an extension was being constructed on the elevation facing

Bargate Lane and an extension had been partially constructed on the North elevation.

7. The proposed extension would be sited on the elevation facing over the fields and the evidence shows that there was a glazed lean-to leading to an entrance door. At the time of my visit this had been removed and the entrance door was clearly visible. This opening had a number of architectural features including a narrow canopy over the door. This door provides the entrance into the hallway with the stairs leading directly up to the first floor. This traditional layout is indicative that the door, despite facing the open fields, would have been the original principal entrance to the dwelling.
8. For these reasons, I consider that the elevation facing the field is the principal elevation of the original dwelling house and therefore I shall refer to it as such.
9. The proposed extension would extend almost the entire width of the principle elevation and would result in the loss of the original entrance and fenestration and obscure the white string course. The depth of the proposed extension and the proposed roof pitch appears disproportionate to the scale of the original dwelling. In addition the proposed extension, in combination with the approved and implemented scheme, would greatly increase the footprint of the original dwelling, eroding its original character and form, resulting in a development which fails to respect and enhance the character of the original dwelling.
10. For the collective reasons outlined above, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with the design aims of Policies DP1 and DP13 of the Colchester Borough Council Local Development Framework Development Policies 2010 (DP) which require developments to respect and enhance the character of the original dwelling. It would also conflict with Policy UR2 of the Colchester Borough Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2008 (CS) which seeks to ensure high quality design. It would also be contrary to paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which also seeks to ensure good design.

Character and appearance – surrounding area

11. The appeal site is adjacent to, but outside of the Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), with the boundary being on the opposite side of Bargate Lane. The site has a Public Footpath which runs along its side boundary and there are views of the site across the field from the footpath. The proposed extension would be located on the principle elevation of the dwelling and therefore it would be screened from the AONB by the existing dwelling and the two storey extension that is currently under construction on the rear elevation, which is visible from Bargate Lane.
12. The public footpath provides views towards the AONB and I accept that the proposed extension would be visible, however the single storey scale of the extension would mean its visual impact would be limited. I consider that the main dwelling would remain a distinctive feature within the views towards the AONB and as such the development would conserve the natural beauty of the landscape.
13. I note the Council's Landscape officer objected to the proposed development on the basis that a native hedgerow with native trees would be needed to enhance

the landscape character of the area, as required by policy DP22 of the DP. Having regard to the site's location outside of the AONB I consider that had I been allowing the appeal it would have been possible to secure an appropriate landscaping scheme via a suitably worded condition.

14. In conclusion I consider that the development would conserve, and with appropriate conditions, enable the enhancement of the landscape in accordance with policy DP22 of the DP and policy ENV1 of the CS which seek to conserve and enhance Colchester's natural environment.

Conclusion

15. In conclusion, whilst I have found that the development would conserve the appearance of the wider landscape, significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, such that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR