
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 April 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3359742

Zoli House, 27 Fowler Road, COLCHESTER, CO2 9FF

- 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 Jacek Krajewski against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 242227.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a retrospective application for raising roof height of existing extension to accommodate solar panels and addition of skylights to rear elevation.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal is described as retrospective, and it was evident at the time of the site visit that the development had been completed.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling situated in a suburban residential road. The surrounding area is characterised by continuous built frontages with dwellings either fronting onto the road or possessing shallow front gardens, with car parking courts located to the rear of the dwellings. Within the existing development there are a combination of roof forms in terms of heights and materials, however, the roofs are generally of modest appearance and of similar pitches.
6. The significant increase to the ridge height of the extension beyond that previously approved, has resulted in a steeply pitched roof which awkwardly contrasts with the roof pitch of the main dwelling. Whilst I am satisfied that the increased roof height of the extension remains subordinate to the ridge of the main dwelling, it nevertheless dominates the built form of the side extension with a significant degree of additional massing at roof level. This appears as a discordant addition

lacking a coherence of design when regarded in the context of the form of the original roof of the main dwelling.

7. The roof of the extension is highly visible from within the public realm from Fowler Road and from the car parking courts to the rear of the dwelling. Due to the proximity of the extension to the road and the incongruous and dominant 'top heavy' appearance of the resultant roof structure, it appears unduly prominent in relation to the more traditional roof designs of the immediate surrounding area. As a result, it is harmful to the existing unity and cohesiveness of the development on Fowler Road and disrupts the modest character of rooflines found in the locality. It appears visually jarring within the street scene.
8. The development has an adverse visual effect and harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with Policies SP7, DM13 and DM15 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan 2013-2033 (2022) which require all development to be designed to a high standard and respond positively to its context and surroundings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of other roof types in the surrounding area which they consider support the appeal. However, the examples cited do not appear directly comparable to the circumstances of the appeal scheme, and as they do not exhibit the same characteristics of development, it is therefore reasonable to assess each case on their own individual merits.
10. I have also had regard to the stated impact of the costs on the appellant associated with rectifying the works as undertaken. However, this is not a matter which would attract any significant weight in support of the scheme, and in any event would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm as set out above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR