



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by **H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3363598

14 Langdale Drive, Highwoods, Colchester, Essex, CO4 9TU

- 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 Jamie Garwood against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 250226.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension with rear lean-to extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the street scene and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached brick-built house of a design, materials and detailing reflective of other properties in the area. Although dwellings in the vicinity have been extended and altered, the prevalence of brick and uncomplicated building forms are part of the character of the housing area of which Langdale Drive forms part.
4. The appeal site is wider at the front than the rear, and the gap between the house and the side boundary tapers. Whilst I appreciate that the design of the proposed side extension is constrained by the narrowing of the plot, this results in a disjointed form that would detract from the appearance of the host dwelling. In particular, the narrow and reasonably shallow side projection towards the front of the extension would appear awkward, and would result in a contrived roof form that would conflict with the simpler design of the main house. As noted above, uncomplicated building forms are characteristic of the wider residential area. Moreover, due to the staggered positioning of the appeal property and the neighbouring house, the side elevation of the extension would be highly visible in the street scene.
5. The application form indicates that the proposed materials would be a mix of brick and manufactured boarding. Other than modest areas of cladding to porch canopies, boarding is not a characteristic material in Langdale Drive and nearby roads. This stark contrast to the use of brick would exacerbate the incongruous appearance of the addition, and would add to its prominence in the street scene. Furthermore, whilst I note the appellant's view that the windows in the extension

would match those of the host house, the proposed first-floor front window would be the widest at that level, and none would have the characteristic brick surrounds of the existing windows. I accept that the site is not within a conservation area, but principles of good design apply to all areas.

6. The appellant has drawn attention to other extensions in the area, although only partial details have been provided of the planning permissions granted. These examples support the principle of a two-storey side extension, but they do not appear to share the design and form of the proposal; with both having a more regular footprint and therefore roof design. The extension at 9 Langdale Drive is brick-built and reflects the materials of the host house and street scene. From the information supplied, it is not evident that the materials for the side extension at 19 Langdale Drive included boarding. As a result, these examples offer limited support to the appeal.
7. I appreciate that the proposal seeks to provide additional family living space and to fulfil the potential of the site. I also note that that sufficient garden and parking space would remain. However, in the form proposed, the side extension would result in an unacceptable compromise to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene, and this harm would not be outweighed by the need for the development.
8. The Council raises no concerns regarding the rear lean-to, and I find this element to be acceptable in terms of its design and impact. However, it is not independent of, and severable from, the side extension and as such I am unable to issue a split decision.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed side extension would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property, the street scene and the surrounding area. This would conflict with Policy SP 7 of Section 1 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan¹, which amongst other criteria requires all new development to meet high standards of urban and architectural design, and to respond positively to local character and context. It would also be contrary to Policies DM13 and DM15 of Section 2 of the Local Plan², which together require residential extensions to be compatible with the appearance and character of the original dwelling, including respect for architectural approach, form and detailed design features, and to have no adverse impact on the appearance of the street scene and the character of the area.
10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR

¹ Colchester Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 Section 1, North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Section 1 Plan, adopted 2021

² Colchester Borough Local Plan 2017 – 2033 Section 2, adopted 2022