



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/A1530/D/25/3372951

8 Sussex Road, Colchester, Essex CO3 3QH

- 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 David Rose against the decision of Colchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 251242.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Sussex Road with particular regard to light and outlook; and
 - ii) whether or not the proposal would make adequate provision for parking.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The proposed rear extension would result in a significant increase in the depth of the appeal dwelling at two-storey level. It would project some way beyond the main rear elevation of 10 Sussex Road which is on a similar building line to the current first-floor of the appeal dwelling, and even deeper relative to the closest part of this neighbour which is set back. It would also be of comparable height to the existing dwelling with a pitched roof design and gable end which would add considerable bulk and mass to the upper part of the building. In addition, I observed at my visit that No 10 is at a lower land level to the appeal dwelling so that the height of the extension would appear greater relative to this neighbour.
4. Although the extension would be set in from the boundary, the separation would not be large and I consider the depth and two-storey height of the development would present a highly dominant and overbearing feature when seen at such close range from No 10 and the closest part of its garden. The height and additional bulk at first floor level would also give rise to an unwelcome degree of enclosure. Irrespective of the design and materials of the development and the overall size of the garden, I find as a result that there would be a notable loss of outlook for occupiers of No 10.
5. Furthermore, the appeal dwelling sits to the south of No 10. In this orientation and given its proximity to the boundary, the depth and relative height of the extension would be likely to give rise to some overshadowing and a noticeable loss of light to

the windows and space to the rear of this neighbour. This loss in combination with the loss of outlook would cause marked detriment to living conditions for occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 10 Sussex Road through loss of outlook and light. As a consequence, it would conflict with Policy SP7 of the Colchester Borough Local Plan Section 1 2021 and Policies DM13 and DM15 of the Colchester Local Plan Section 2 2022 insofar as they include requirements broadly for proposals to protect and promote residential amenity and to avoid unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

Parking

7. The Essex Parking Standards - Design and Good Practice 2009 ('the EPS') set out that a dwelling with two or more bedrooms should have a minimum of two parking spaces. The proposal would increase the number of bedrooms within the appeal dwelling from three to four, but the minimum parking requirement in accordance with the EPS would remain as two spaces.
8. In terms of the provision of parking, the proposal indicates that an existing garage would be reduced in depth, but the Council accepts that the dimensions of the garage would in any event be insufficient to be considered a parking space in accordance with the EPS. There would not therefore be a loss of existing parking. Furthermore, the Council suggests that there is one parking space to the front of the site, but I observed hardstanding across the frontage which would appear sufficient to accommodate two vehicles. Although accessing space closest to No 10 would require occupiers to first move any vehicle parked alongside the boundary with 6b Sussex Road behind the highway access, I have no firm reason to consider that this would be unduly impractical nor, given conditions on Sussex Road, that there would be harm to highway safety. On that basis, the proposal would meet the minimum parking requirement in the EPS.
9. Taking these factors together, I conclude that the proposal would make adequate provision for parking and I do not identify conflict with Policy DM22 of the Section 2 Local Plan insofar as it broadly seeks appropriate levels of parking and indicates that parking provision for new residential development will be assessed having regard to the most recent local Parking Standards.

Conclusion

10. Although I have found that there would be adequate provision for parking, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to living conditions for neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when it is read as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR