



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 September 2021

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/W/21/3271084

1 & 2 The Folley, Stanway, CO3 0RJ

- 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 R. Chadwick against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 202487, dated 3 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is part single storey, part two storey side, rear and front extensions to Nos 1 & 2 The Folley including demolition of existing single side extension to No. 1 The Folley and removal of existing chimneys.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's emerging Local Plan has been submitted for examination, but no indication has been provided of a timescale for its potential adoption. Its policies therefore carry limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed extensions would substantially increase the depth and width of the existing houses. The scale of development is significant, with wide gables introduced both to the front and rear elevations of the houses. The windows to the front and rear gables would be too small relative to the width of the gables. Together with the multiple small windows to the front elevation, the development would overall result in the houses appearing overly bulky and poorly proportioned. The detailed design of the extensions would consequently result in a poor overall appearance to the extended houses.
5. The houses occupy a backland plot and are not prominent in the surrounding area, with mature landscaping and close-boarded fencing restricting visibility from outside the site. However, this would not justify allowing a development that overall is of poor design.
6. Both main parties have referred to an earlier permission granted in 2013 for extensions to the appeal properties. Those extensions were of similar scale, but the appearance and detailed design were significantly different to those

currently proposed. That approval therefore carries limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

7. My attention has been drawn to buildings at the neighbouring school, which are visible from within the appeal site and form part of its context. However, an educational use is very different from the residential use of the houses and requires a different scale of development. These therefore carry very little weight in the determination of this appeal.
8. The proposed development would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy DP1 of the Colchester Development Policies 2010 and Policy UR2 of the Core Strategy 2008. Collectively these policies require that development respect and enhance the character of the site, its context and surrounding in terms of its architectural approach, scale, form, proportions and detailed design features.

Conclusion

9. There are no reasons to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR