



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/D/25/3363111

61 Station Road, Alresford, Colchester, Essex CO7 8AA

- 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 Andy Robinson against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application ref is 24/01593/FULHH.
 - The development proposed is a side dormer (following demolition of chimney stack).
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a single-storey, gable fronted dwelling located on a residential road. Immediately adjacent to the property is the railway station and level crossing. The area has a mix of domestic building styles, including bungalows such as the appeal site and its immediate neighbours, and two storey dwellings, some of which have commercial premises to the ground floor. The properties are typically set back from the road beyond short lawns and driveways, which are mostly bound by low-level walls and shrubbery. The mixed presence of residential and commercial properties and the rail station gives the area a pleasantly busy character, with a strong visual presence of the rail infrastructure.
5. The position of the appeal dwelling means that the proposed side dormer would be highly visible from both the front of the property and the northern stretch of Station Road, creating long views on approach to the dwelling. Due to the proximity of the rail line and station, the host dwelling and the proposal would feature prominently in views from both the level crossing and the platform.
6. The proposed dormer would represent a departure from the established pattern of development and would disrupt the existing rhythm of the roofscape, which is modest and uncluttered. The bulk and massing of the proposed development would be an incongruous addition to the area, and given the visually prominent position of

the dwelling, would create harm to the character and appearance when experienced from the established vantage points.

7. The dormer would extend to almost the full width of the existing roof, and as such would fail to be subservient to the host dwelling. This would result in the dwelling appearing top-heavy and overly intrusive within the street scene, thereby causing harm to its character and appearance.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to the side dormer on the neighbouring property, no. 63 Station Road. Whilst the example has comparable characteristics with the proposal, the dormer in question has an overall smaller massing. The neighbouring dwelling also commands a less visually prominent position within the street scene, reducing the visibility and therefore harm of the dormer.
9. I conclude it would therefore fail to comply with Policies SP7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond North Essex Shared Authorities Shared Strategic Section 1 (2021) and SPL3 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Section 2 (2022) which together seek to ensure that development responds well to the site, the local character and context. It would also further not accord with the Essex Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised other matters such as the proposed materials and lack of overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring residential properties. Whilst these factors weigh in favour of the proposal, they do not outweigh the harm I have found.

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.

E Clifford

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.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR