



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2025 by E Nutman BA (Hons)

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/D/25/3361739

112 Rectory Road, Little Oakley, Essex CO12 5LE

- 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 Stephen Armitage against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01492/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a replacement single storey rear extension and the erection of a side two-storey extension and a single garage.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council's reason for refusal relates to the two-storey extension only and the accompanying officer report confirms that this is the main area of concern. I have therefore defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed two-storey extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 112 Rectory Road (No 112) is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling. It is situated amongst a small row of properties in an area of prevailing rural character. The adjoining cottage, 110 Rectory Road, closely reflects No 112 being of a modest width with a similar door and window arrangement to the front, as well as painted rendered elevations. They share a gable-ended roof which transitions into a catslide form to the rear. Large chimney stacks bookend the roof of the semi-detached pair. These shared characteristics create a distinctive pair of cottages which given their prominent position close to the road, this positively contributes to the rural character of the area.
6. The scale and width of the two-storey extension, together with the fenestration to the front elevation including a front door, would give it the appearance of a separate dwelling. However, any attempts to replicate the architectural characteristics of the existing pair would be compromised by the inconsistent and poorly aligned window

pattern to the front elevation and the absence of a gable end chimney. This would be further compounded by the uncharacteristic rear gable, which would not reflect the modest form including the distinctive catslide roof on the existing pair.

Consequently, and even with the use of matching facing materials, the proposal would be a discordant addition. It would not read as an extension and, even as a 'third cottage', would detract from the symmetry and distinctive characteristics of the existing semi-detached pair. This would be to the detriment of the immediate surroundings on Rectory Road.

7. I understand that the design has been influenced by pre-application advice and subsequent planning approvals in 2015 and 2016¹, although I have not been provided with a copy of the related drawings. However, the appellant has indicated that the previous designs included different window levels to those now proposed. In any case, there is no evidence to suggest that those applications have not long since expired. They would also have been considered against a previous development plan. I accept that the host dwelling is not a designated heritage asset. There is also nothing to dispute the appellant's contention that the fenestration pattern is a result of building regulations requirements and that a smaller extension would not meet the desires of the appellant in term of practical internal space. Even so, these matters do not justify the harm that would result from the proposal.
8. In conclusion, the proposed two-storey extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such the development would conflict with Policies SP 7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond – Section 1 North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Plan (2021) and SPL 3 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Section 2 (2022) which require high standards of design, that development maintains or enhances local character and distinctiveness and that development relates well to its site and surroundings.
9. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with Paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework which confirm that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

E Nutman

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Refs 15/01246/FUL and 15/01816/FUL