



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by Jonathan Price BA(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3365923

4 Warwick Bailey Close, Colchester, Essex CO4 5ER

- 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 Rakesh Krishnan against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 250600.
 - The development proposed is to demolish existing rear conservatory and provide two-storey rear extension and part single, part two-storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a house situated at the end of a small cul-de-sac of similarly large, detached houses with separate garaging. The houses are each of a bespoke design but their general scale and classical designs and proportions create a degree of architectural coherence. Although the site is not within a Conservation Area, and there are no other specific restrictions, general design considerations apply.
4. The proposal includes two elements. At the front, a single storey extension would link the main house to the hipped roofed double garage to its fore. Above this, the existing two-storey front gable element would be accompanied by a second such feature, extending forward from the side hip to the main roof. This would be of the same design, scale and height as that set centrally on the front elevation to the house, remaining slightly set back to preserve a degree of subservience. The general design, scale and proportions of this front addition would fit in adequately with the existing appearance of the main house. Neither overwhelming in scale nor absorbing the garaging, this front extension would preserve the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the built surroundings.
5. The second element is a proposed extension of the existing two storey rear projection, creating an elongated lounge downstairs and bedroom above. Although keeping to the same footprint as the replaced single storey conservatory, this would create rather an unbalanced mass to the original form of the house, adding a significant degree of additional bulk. Running at the same eaves and ridge height

as the existing roof, without any distinct articulation or reduced scale, the rear extension would not appear as a suitably subservient addition to the original house. The rather overwhelming increase in mass, perceived particularly in the unrelieved expanse of brick work to the outward facing side elevation, would detract from the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.

6. This two-storey element would be to the rear of the house and less prominent in the street scene than the front additions. The vegetation around the back garden would help screen exterior views. The Council has not found the proposal to result in any material harm to neighbouring amenities through loss of privacy or light to adjacent windows. The addition might not be so large as to have significantly harmful effects on neighbouring living conditions through being overbearing on outlooks. However, this does not alter my view that the rear extension proposed would over dominate the host dwelling and detract markedly from its currently well-proportioned design. The surrounding vegetation might mitigate the harm but does not avoid nor justify the adverse effects this addition would have on the existing character and appearance of the host dwelling and its built setting.
7. The development plan provides relevant policies over the design considerations pertaining to this case, which this proposal would conflict with. These are the policies most important for determining this appeal and are not out of date by virtue of their general consistency with those of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In such circumstances, its presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply. This would therefore not weigh in favour of a scheme found to be in conflict with an up-to-date development plan, where NPPF paragraph 12 advises permission should not usually be granted. Consequently, I conclude the appeal does not succeed.

Jonathan Price

INSPECTOR