



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/D/25/3366047

1 London Road, Little Clacton, Essex CO16 9RW

- 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 Christopher Paul Clarke against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00229/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is a car-port.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a car-port at 1 London Road, Little Clacton, Essex CO16 9RW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00229/FULHH, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing buildings.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a two storey detached house with additional living space in the loft. It is located at the junction of London Road with Holland Road. The dwelling fronts onto London Road, and there is a detached garage to the flank side that faces towards Holland Road. Between the garage and the boundary fence with Holland Road is an open area of the front garden with hard standing for parking. It is this area that is the proposed location of the carport.
4. The appeal dwelling is located at the centre of Little Clacton and there is a small triangular green with trees opposite on Holland Road where it bifurcates and joins with The Street, which reads as a continuation of London Road. The green opposite combines with the churchyard and open parking area of the Church of St James on the other side of The Street, to form a spacious and verdant centre

to Little Clacton, which is surrounded by other close set properties with relatively shallow front gardens that provide a defined enclosure to this open area.

5. In height, footprint and scale the proposed car-port would approximately mirror that of the existing garage on the appeal site. The proposal would be constructed in materials and with a tile roof to match the existing garage, albeit with an open front, but with the rear and flanks in a magnolia coloured cladding to match with the garage and the appeal dwelling. The flank side nearest to Hollard Road would be set back from the side boundary fence with that street by approximately 1.8 metres. This separating distance to the boundary narrows slightly at the curve of the junction of Hollard Road with London Road. This set back would result in the flank of the proposal aligning with the boundary wall of the neighbouring property on Holland Road, which is set back from the street at this point.
6. From my site visit it is evident that what appears to be a laurel hedge has been planted close to the inside face of the timber boundary fence of the appeal dwelling with Holland road. This is of a height that it already stands above the timber fence. Given the single storey and open nature of the proposed timber car-port, the set back of the proposal from Holland Road and the recently planted laurel hedge, I am satisfied that the proposal would not represent an obtrusive addition to the appeal site and would not constitute a bold and stark addition that would be highly prominent in the street scene.
7. Rather I find that due to its scale, materials and positioning on the appeal site, the proposal would appear in street views as a secondary and subordinate addition, which would read as part of the enclosing properties that define the boundary with the open area at the centre of Little Clacton. As such, I find that the proposal would be a complementary addition to the local street scene and would not result in any significant detrimental effect on the open character or appearance of the local area .

Other Matters

8. The proposal would be seen, albeit obliquely, in conjunction with two listed buildings: The Grade II* listed Church of St James and the Grade II listed Westbourne cottage. Both of which are some distance from the proposal on the opposite side of The Street. The Council officer's report states that the council found that the proposal has no significant effect on the setting of these listed buildings. However, under section 66(1) of the Planning and Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990, I have a responsibility in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Given the scale of the proposal, the set back from the street and the laurel hedge and the oblique views and distances to these two listed buildings, I see no reason to demur from the Council's conclusion in this regard.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the immediate or wider local area. This would accord with Policy SPL7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013 -2033 Section 1 (2021) and Policy SPL3 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013 -2033 Section 2 (2022). Collectively these seek development that are of a high standard

of urban and architectural design, which relate well to its site and surroundings, responding positively to local character and context and that maintains local distinctiveness.

Conditions

10. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawing and materials that match existing.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR