



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2025

by **J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3358799

The Coach House, Halstead Road, Eight Ash Green, Essex CO6 3PT

- 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 Boulding and Moore Limited against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 242151.
 - The development proposed is erection of outbuilding, incorporating existing shed, incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed outbuilding on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling with first floor accommodation in the roof space located on the south side of Halstead Road with open land opposite. The surrounding area outside the main settlement of Eight Ash Green includes sporadic residential development of varied design and appearance.
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 Section 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 outside settlement limits, Policies ENV1 and OV2 of the Local Plan Section 2 are relevant, which require development not to adversely affect the character of the countryside.
6. The existing outbuilding is located forward of the front elevation of the host dwelling and while it is prominent in the street scene due to this layout, it is a building of modest scale that is subordinate to the dwelling. Moreover, its limited size and forward position on the plot allows for a good degree of separation and openness between the buildings, which is readily appreciable from surrounding views.

7. The proposed outbuilding would be substantively larger than the existing building, with a footprint comparable to that of the host dwelling. As such, it would add considerable depth of built form into the site, which would undermine the visual separation of the two buildings, resulting in a cramped form of overdevelopment. Furthermore, despite the extended building's single storey height, due to its overall size and proximity to the host dwelling, it would compete visually with the principal building rather than being subordinate to it as is the case with the existing outbuilding.
8. In terms of design and appearance, the extended building would retain the existing pitched roof form of the current building to the front, with a large extent of flat roof of differing heights behind this. Seen in profile directly next to the host dwelling this roof form would appear incongruous and uncharacteristic in relation to the simple pitched roof forms of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties.
9. The appellant contends that a similar form of building could be erected as permitted development. However, as there is no specific alternative proposal before me it is not possible to make a direct comparison with the harmful effects of the appeal proposal, as found above.
10. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed outbuilding would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site 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.

Conclusion

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

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR