



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3368663

100 Lisle Road, Colchester, CO2 7SA

- 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 Ms F Golding against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 250472.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension above part of existing single storey projection.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension above part of existing single storey projection at 100 Lisle Road, Colchester, CO2 7SA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 250472, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) Notwithstanding the indication of the external materials to be used in the development, the choice of the materials will be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in writing before any work other than preparatory operations such as preparing the roof of the existing ground floor, erection of scaffolding, etc, and the development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the agreed details.
 - 3) No demolition or construction work shall take place outside of the following times: weekdays 08:00 -18:00; Saturdays 08:00 -13:00; Sundays and Bank Holidays – No working.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the terrace of dwellings in which it is situated.

Reasons

3. Number 100 Lisle Road is a house in a traditional terrace of 2-storeys, each having an outrigger. Its neighbour, No.102, is the end of the terrace and is at a bend in the road. As a result, the rear of the appeal property can be seen from that part of Lisle Road which is immediately round the bend, across the rear garden of No.102 and past the flank of No.104.

4. Colchester Borough Local Plan, the National Planning Policy Framework, and the Essex Design guide all require high quality design. Policy DM13 of the Local Plan relates specifically to domestic development and sets out detailed criteria in respect of proposed residential extensions. This policy requires proposals to be compatible with the scale, appearance and character of the original dwelling, subordinate to the original dwelling, not to result in adverse impact to the appearance of the street scene and character of the area and not result in the over-development of the site.
5. Having regard to these criteria, the proposed first floor extension would be set on part of an existing ground floor extension at the rear of the house, alongside the outrigger. It would project 2m from the main rear wall and its pitch roof would be set down from the roof of the outrigger, and would slope at the same angle. It is proposed that the external materials would differ from those of the outrigger. Taking the proposed extension as a whole, it would be compatible with the scale, appearance and character of the original dwelling, and subordinate to it. The existing east side of the outrigger to No.102, which faces towards the part of Lisle Road that is round the bend, is a blank elevation, in that case finished in a white render. The east side of the proposed extension would also be blank, and like its neighbour, would have a different exterior finish
6. As to the appearance of the street, the proposed extension would be seen from a short length of that part of Lisle Road that is around the bend, past the flank of No.104, and beyond a high wall at the back edge of the footway, and over a flat roofed garage within the curtilage of No.102. Thus it would be a very minor feature, glimpsed rather than in full view from the street. It would not result in an adverse impact to the appearance of the streetscene and character of the area and would not result in the over-development of the site.
7. For these reasons, the proposed first floor rear extension would broadly comply with Policy DM13. The one reservation I have about the proposal is the choice the proposed external materials. The scheme proposes the use of wooden shingles to match the wooden shingles used on the ground floor rear extension, above which the first floor extension would be constructed. These materials are not traditional to the area and would draw attention to the extension in such a way that the impact on the streetscene would be heightened, rather than allow it to be unobtrusive. Furthermore, the shingles on the ground floor extension are not visible from the street, so that the coordination between the 2 elements would not be apparent in the public view. I consider that this shortcoming in the proposal could be overcome by a different choice of material, such as a white render to match the neighbour's outrigger. This could be dealt with by a condition.
8. For the reasons I have given, the proposed extension, with the modification to the external materials that I have mentioned, would meet the requirements of planning policy.

Conditions

9. The statutory condition that provides a time limit on the start of development must be imposed. In addition, the council has suggested 3 conditions in the event that the appeal is upheld. I have considered these in the light of Planning Practice Guidance. The council's suggested conditions deal with materials, conformity with the plans, and limits on hours of working on the development.

10. I consider that the conditions should be imposed to ensure that the materials will enable the development to integrate with the existing buildings, as I have described in paragraph 7, and to ensure that the construction work is not detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The council's suggest condition about conformity with the plans is necessary for certainty and avoidance of doubt as to the development permitted, but in the case of this modest development, it can be incorporated into the permission itself.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR