



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2024

by A Hartley, LLB(Hons), Solicitor, MBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/D/24/3345735

23 Linnet Way, Great Bentley, Colchester, Essex CO7 8QJ

- 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 RH Management Anglia Ltd against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00380/FULHH.
 - The appeal development is a rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. At the site visit I saw that a rear extension had already taken place.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the appeal development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi detached brick built bungalow, with an element of painted white render on its façade at the front. The side and rear elevations are brick. It is small in scale and design. It is situated within a cul de sac of very similar properties that also feature white render on the façade.
5. The appeal development is a single storey rear extension with a flat roof. The extension protrudes beyond the side elevation so that it is visible in the streetscene. The height exceeds that of the eaves of the host dwelling, resulting in a dominant, bulky and disproportionate extension. The materials used are timber and white render. Despite a small element of white render on the front elevation, the majority of the dwelling is of brick material. The addition of white render to the extension visually exacerbates its dominance and poor relationship to both the host dwelling and the character of the surrounding area.
6. My attention has been drawn to other extensions in the wider surrounding area. I find that these examples relate to dwellings of different design within different contexts. It is also unclear whether these were built recently, or constructed before the current policies requiring good design were adopted. I

therefore attach very limited weight to these in my determination of this appeal.

7. Due to its poor design, prominence in the street scene, scale, height, bulk and materials the appeal development harms the character of the host dwelling and does not respond positively to the local character and context, failing to preserve and enhance the quality of the surrounding area. Consequently I find that the appeal development conflicts with policy SP7 (Section 1) (2021) and policy SPL3 (Section 2) (2022) of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033, because the extension fails to exhibit architectural quality and has not been well designed.
8. In addition, the appeal development conflicts with paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) due to its poor design and detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding built development.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no material considerations including the Framework that outweigh the harm caused by the appeal development. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Hartley

INSPECTOR