
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/22/3298651

122 Bourne Road, Colchester CO2 8RS

- 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 Steve Clark against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 213246, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension (revision to 202500).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council relies on policies from the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan, which it indicates is at an advanced stage having undergone examination hearing sessions and consultation on main modifications following receipt of the Inspector's report. Given that the plan is well advanced towards adoption I see no reason not to give substantive weight to the relevant policies¹.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a residential road of varied property types.
5. Policy DP1 of the Colchester Borough Development Policies document (2010, amended 2014), Policy UR2 of the Colchester Borough Core Strategy (2008, amended 2014) and Policy DM15 of the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan all concern design and include requirements relating to high quality design in new development, and respect for the character and scale of existing development and the surrounding area. Policy DM13 of the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan concerns domestic development, including residential extensions, which are required to be compatible with and subordinate to the scale, appearance and

¹ In accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

character of the original dwelling, including taking into account the cumulative impact of such development.

6. An approved two storey side extension was under construction at the time of the inspection². The appellant refers to a previous unsuccessful application for a similar form of two storey extension to the appeal proposal and that the current proposal is intended to respond to the reason for refusal in the earlier case³. While I have noted this, the current appeal involves a separate proposal which I have considered on its own merits.
7. The host dwelling in its original form was a well-proportioned building with a front gable feature. This feature is replicated through the approved extension currently under construction. The appeal proposal would add to this in the form of a further side extension with a small dormer to the first floor above an integral garage.
8. The design of the proposed extension includes elements that would help to mitigate some effects of the additional bulk added to the side. In particular, the lower roof height, 'catslide' roof form with a hip and setback from the frontage would help to reduce the impact of the extension. However, the combined effect of the two extensions would be to double the frontage width of the original dwelling. Due to this significant increase in size across the frontage, and despite the features described, the extensions would dominate and not be subservient to the original built form as required by the relevant development plan policies, thereby harming the dwelling's character and appearance.
9. There are examples of paired semi-detached dwellings of similar size within the row which includes the appeal property. However, the extended single dwelling would appear incongruous and uncharacteristic due to its excessive width and overall bulk and mass compared to these paired dwellings and to the original built form of the appeal property. The raised ground level above the road and position of the appeal property at the end of the row means that it is particularly prominent from surrounding views. From these views, the excessive size and dominant appearance of the extended dwelling would be readily apparent, with resultant harm to the character and appearance of the street scene.
10. The appellant draws attention by way of comparison to extensions at Nos 114 and 116 Bourne Road. However, this pair of properties appear to be unaltered to the front and, therefore, the effects of any extensions that have taken place to the rear are not comparable to the effects on the street scene of the extensions to the appeal property. As such, this comparison does not overcome the harm that would result from the appeal proposal in combination with the approved extension. I acknowledge that a separate garage could be built as permitted development. However, this would not have the same effects as the adjoining two storey extension.
11. Therefore, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed side extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to

² Ref 162415.

³ Ref 202500.

Policy DP1 of the Colchester Borough Development Policies document, Policy UR2 of the Colchester Borough Core Strategy and to Policies DM13 and DM15 of the Section 2 Colchester Local Plan, as described above. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design. Policy SP7 of the North Essex Authorities Shared Strategic Section 1 Local Plan (2021) referred to by the Council is not directly relevant in this case as it concerns new garden communities in North Essex.

12. I acknowledge that the proposed extension is intended to create additional living space. However, these personal circumstances do not overcome the harm and conflict with development plan policies that I have found would result from the proposal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR