



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/Y/24/3348957

5 Stockwell, Colchester, Essex CO1 1HP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Benjamin Storer against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 240503.
 - The works proposed are I am looking to replace the front door of my Grade II listed with a like-for-like replacement including the attaching door frame as the current doorframe have a crack on the inside as well as come away from the joining outside wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the works on the special architectural and historic interest of 5 Stockwell a grade II listed building and whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Colchester Conservation Area

Reasons

Significance

4. No 5 Stockwell is part of a range of eighteenth century timber framed and plastered cottages listed grade II. They are two storeys with tiled roofs. The cottages have similar windows and Nos 1 and 3 and Nos 5 and 7 each have matching timber doors. Their significance, for the purposes of this appeal, lies within the architectural and historic interest of their remaining features demonstrating early examples of residential accommodation in Colchester.
5. The appeal property is within the Colchester Conservation Area No 1 (the CA) which covers the historic core of the city. As such it covers a range of building types and styles, and its significance is derived from the historic buildings and street patterns demonstrating the evolution of the historic core. The appeal property contributes to the significance by its historic quality and remaining fabric and structure which demonstrates a particular time of construction in the city. Its

position within a terrace of buildings with similar features contributes to that significance.

Impact

6. The proposal is for a new timber door and frame. The proposed door and frame would be hard wood timber with white coating and details from an Anglian brochure have been supplied. These are basic and limited in detail. However, while the appellant states the door would match the existing, from the documentation provided it would not be the same.
7. In particular, while the pattern would be similar, the exact proportions of its pattern would not replicate that existing. As such, it would be different to that at No 7, forming an obtrusive feature, in an otherwise uniform façade harming the significance of the building itself and its contribution to the significance of the CA.

Balance

8. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to their conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets or from development within their setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification.
9. With reference to paragraphs 214 and 215 of the Framework, in finding harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, the magnitude of that harm should be assessed. Given the fairly limited nature and extent of the proposed works I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight.
10. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, which includes securing of optimum viable use of listed buildings. I have had regard to the appellant's submission that the existing door frame is in a poor state of repair, which I saw to be the case at my site visit. Therefore, he considers that the proposal would be an improvement and help with security and prevent harm due to damp penetration.
11. There is little substantive information before me to demonstrate why the existing door frame could not be repaired. However, even if it were the case that the frame and door would need to be replaced, particularly given that they would need to be of the same wood, I see no reason why an exact replica could not be provided which would conserve the significance of the listed building and the CA.
12. Furthermore, there is no meaningful substantive evidence before me that confirms that this work is the only way of securing the optimum viable use or that the buildings preservation would be at risk if the appeals were to fail and the proposal was not implemented. Consequently, I give the benefits associated with the proposed door limited weight.
13. Therefore, I conclude that the public benefits of the proposal in this instance would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified. Given the above and in the absence of any significant public benefit, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II

listed building and the character and appearance of the CA. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 212 of the Framework and conflict with policies ENV1, DM16 and DM15 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan 2017-2033 adopted 2022. Together, these require that development protects, conserves or enhances townscape, and the significance of heritage assets.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that, the appeal should be dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR