
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2022

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/22/3307221

133 Maldon Road, Tiptree, Colchester, CO5 0PH

- 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 Andrew Downman against the decision of Colchester Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 221612 dated 27 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The single issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The site contains a 2-storey chalet style detached residential property located on the southern side of Maldon Road, within a semi-rural area of frontage development that runs out of the main built-up area of Tiptree. The immediate surrounding development on the appeal site side of Maldon Road consists of bungalows, whilst the development opposite is largely of substantial 2-storey dwellings.
4. The existing front elevation of the appeal property has the appearance of a bungalow that has been extended over time. To the right there is a forward projecting element under a hipped roof, behind which the main body of the bungalow extends under a hipped roof containing 3 gabled dormer windows. At the south-west end of the bungalow, the ground floor extends under 2 lower hipped roofs with a valley between. The first floor accommodation is situated within the main roof space. The 3 gabled dormer windows mentioned above are offset slightly to the left in respect length of the roof ridge. Overall, the elements combine to form a pleasing ensemble with a mature appearance achieved with the brick front elevation and tiled roof.
5. At the rear of the existing dwelling there is a substantial wing extending out, under a gabled roof, the ridge of which aligns with the centre of the 3 dormers at the front. There is a flat roofed dormer in the main roof, immediately to the south-west of this wing. The ridge of the gabled roof of this wing is at a much

lower level than that of the main roof. The the proposed first floor extension is situated above the wing just described.

6. The roof of the proposed extension would have a gable at the rear, with a hip where it joins the main roof of the bungalow, following the angle of the roof to which it joins. It would be would constructed with a rendered finish, as used on the existing walls of the extension, and would re-use the tiles from the existing roof. The ridge of the extension would be 1.8m above the existing ridge.
7. To a degree the view from the highway is curtailed by a large double garage in front of the dwelling, set under a high half-hipped roof, although there are clear views from across the frontage of Nos. 131 and from the west on the footway on the other side of the road, and when looking directly in at the entrance of the driveway with the road. However, the main public vantage point would be from the area around the junction of Maldon Road with West End Road in the vicinity of the Ship Inn.
8. When viewed from the front, the rising hip end would look incongruent with the existing ensemble of elements that make up the current front elevations, bearing no clear relationship to the existing main roof in visual terms. When viewed obliquely from the other side of Maldon Road, particularly in the vicinity of the junction previously referred to, it would be quite apparent as a bulky rear extension that would dominate the form of the existing bungalow.

Conclusions

9. In view of the above observations, I conclude that the proposed first floor rear extension would be of poor design, dominating and not well related to the existing bungalow and would sit poorly in the streetscene. As such it would have a harmful effect on the appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus it would be contrary to Policy DM15 'Design and Amenity' of the adopted Local Plan and paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seek a high standard of design. Therefore the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR