



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

by **R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/W/25/3373744

Pear Trees, Pork Lane, Great Holland CO13 0JE

- 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, Miss Alice & Miss Charlotte Gosling against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00882/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of 2 self-build bungalows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Pork Lane is a residential street with predominantly detached single and 2 storey dwellings. The buildings along the street are moderately set back from the pavement and are reasonably spaced such that the area has a pleasant spacious character and appearance. Pear Trees is the existing dwelling on the site and is sited a significant distance from the street. Although Pear Trees may not be subject to any development plan designations, its form and scale along with its spacious front garden, provides a positive contribution to the spacious character of the area and provides a pleasant transition from the settlement to the open countryside.
4. While some dwellings are positioned in a linear fashion along Pork Lane, there are cul-de-sac developments near the appeal site including at Montrose Gardens and Orchard Drive such that the area has a varied pattern of development. However, the dwellings along Pork Lane generally face the street and have rear gardens or have moderate spacing with the dwelling behind it such that this road has a pleasant spacious quality.
5. The proposed dwellings would occupy a large part of the front garden of the existing dwelling and would be sited close together. This would result in a cramped appearance that would harm the spacious feel of Pork Lane. There may not be harm to the trees on the site, the proposal would provide adequate private amenity space for future occupiers, and some views of Pear Trees would be retained via the proposed driveway. Whilst other dwellings in the area have limited spacing including at Montrose Gardens, these are generally set a significant distance from Pork Lane such that they do not harm the spacious feel of the street. However, given their siting and massing, the proposed dwellings would diminish the spacious quality of the site and adversely affect the open character of the area.

6. As the site lies at the boundary of the settlement and close to Pork Lane, the scheme would be seen in several public views including from the north. In contrast, the development at Montrose Gardens lies to rear of Montrose and a significant distance from Pork Lane. The development at Montrose Gardens is therefore not directly comparable with the appeal scheme.
7. In addition, the proposed dwellings would face the driveway rather than Pork Lane. The side elevations of both dwellings have few features and a large area of blank wall. Therefore, the view from the street would be primarily of the fairly plain side elevation of the dwelling at Plot 1. This would exacerbate the cramped appearance of the scheme. Although there is vegetation along the boundary of the site and a landscaping condition could secure further planting, the degree of screening could not be guaranteed and would not fully mitigate the harm to the character of the area.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy SP7 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Section 1 North Essex Authorities' Shared Strategic Section 1 Plan Adopted January 2021 which seeks, among other things, development that positively responds to local character and Policy SPL3 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Section 2 Adopted 25th January 2022 which seeks, among other things, new development that maintain or enhance local character.

Other Matters

9. The proposal would contribute 2 self-build dwellings to the local housing supply. I note the applications for inclusion on the Self-Build and Custom-Build Register. However, there is no planning obligation before me which secures the development as being self-build as defined in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended). A condition requiring occupation of the dwelling by the person who built it would be unlikely to pass the tests set out in the Framework.
10. I acknowledge the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. However, given the limited scale of development and my findings above, these matters have not altered my overall decision.
11. The proposal would be located within the Zone of Influence of Hamford Water Special Protection Area and Ramsar site. Had I found that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the area, an appropriate assessment would have been necessary. However, this has not proved to be a determinative matter given the harm identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu INSPECTOR