

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2021

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/21/3275545

44 St. Peters Road, West Mersea, Colchester, Essex CO5 8LL

- 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 Nicholas Calcutt against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 210730 was refused by notice dated 23 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension that will bring it back to the building line of the road. Front door/porch will change to be in a new open planned room to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and setting of the host dwelling and the character and context of the existing streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property lies within a primarily residential area characterised by a mix of styles of predominately detached two-storey, chalet bungalows and bungalows. Large forward extensions on chalet bungalows are not a characteristic of the streetscene. The appeal property is a detached chalet bungalow adjacent to a recently constructed two-storey dwelling with a front two-storey projection. The appeal dwelling is set back within the streetscene behind a loose building line of adjacent properties. The set back provides a somewhat spacious setting for the dwelling.
4. The proposal is for a forward projection comprising a single-storey extension with a front gable. Whilst it would be lower than the existing ridge line, it would add an extension of significant bulk to the property which would not integrate successfully with the modest design of the existing dwelling. As such, it would be a dominant addition in a prominent front garden location. The bulk of the proposed front projection would create a cramped form of development on this site. From my observations, due to the scale and design of the proposal in such a position, it would overwhelm the setting and character of the existing dwelling. It would appear as an incongruous addition, not in keeping

with the design and scale of this modest bungalow. In such a prominent position, this would be to the detriment of the character and context of the existing streetscene.

5. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised including the design of the adjacent recently constructed dwelling. Whilst that dwelling has a forward projection, the design and scale of that projection is integral to the overall design of the dwelling.
6. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and setting of the host dwelling and the character and context of the existing streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to Policy UR2 in the Colchester Borough Council Core Strategy (2008) (revised 2014) and Policy DP1 in the Colchester Borough Council Development Policies (2010) (revised 2014), where they seek high quality design.
7. Since the Council made its decision, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. It continues to seek high standards of design. I consider the development plan policies referred to above to be broadly consistent with the Framework, especially where the Framework seeks to ensure good design.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR