

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2024

by **J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2024P

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/24/3345646

Orchard House, Boxted Road, Great Horkesley, Essex CO6 4AP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Frank Barton against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 240088.
 - The development proposed is minor alterations to previously approved garage including additional dormers and ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed alterations to the approved garage building on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling in a rural location with open countryside and some sporadic residential and commercial development in the surrounding area.
 4. Policy SP7 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 Section 1 (2021) and Policy DM15 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan 2017-2033 Section 2 (2022) both require development to meet high design standards, including that it should preserve and not harm local character. Policy DM13 of the Local Plan Part 2 requires residential outbuildings to be compatible with the scale, appearance and character of the original dwelling, be subordinate in terms of design setting, and avoid adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area.
 5. As the appeal property is in the countryside outside settlement limits, Policies ENV1 and OV2 are relevant, which require development not to adversely affect the character of the countryside.
 6. The host dwelling has a shallow pitch to the hipped roof, with the existing single storey garage sharing the same roof form. The approved garage building has a barn hipped roof, which in the current proposal would be taller with the inclusion of
-

front and rear dormers. I acknowledge that the increase in height between the approved and proposed buildings is limited. However, the inclusion of the dormers is a more marked change. The dormers to the front in particular would be a prominent feature due to the position of the building forward of the host dwelling. They would accentuate the taller, bulkier roof form compared to those of the host dwelling and existing garage building. Moreover, the dormer windows would not reflect the character and appearance of the existing buildings' roof forms, contrary to the requirements for outbuildings in Policy DM13. As such, the overall roof form with the inclusion of the dormer windows would be an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature.

7. The taller garage building with dormer windows would be prominent due to the openness of the setting and the layout of buildings on the site, with the new garage furthest forward. Existing planting to the side boundary and the trees to the front would have limited effect in mitigating the visual prominence of the garage and its uncharacteristic appearance in relation to the existing buildings on site.
8. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed alterations to the approved garage building would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal is contrary to Policy SP7 of the Local Plan Section 1 and to Policies DM13, DM15, ENV1 and OV2 of the Local Plan Section 2, as described. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which advocates good design.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that the appellant may be frustrated by the process leading to the Council's decision in this case. However, this matter is not within the scope of this appeal, which concerns the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR