



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 February 2026

by **J Bowyer BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/A1530/W/25/3376658

Little House, High Street, Dedham, Essex CO7 6HJ

- 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 Bobby Jennings and Melissa Herring against the decision of Colchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 251381.
- The development proposed is 'replacement of the existing dormer windows, replacement roof tiles, re rendering and other associated works'.

Appeal B Ref: APP/A1530/Y/25/3376659

Little House, High Street, Dedham, Essex CO7 6HJ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Bobby Jennings and Melissa Herring against the decision of Colchester City Council.
- The application Ref is 251382.
- The works proposed are 'replacement of the existing dormer windows, replacement roof tiles, re rendering and other associated works'.

Decisions

Appeal A

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 'replacement of the existing dormer windows, replacement roof tiles, re rendering and other associated works' at Little House, High Street, Dedham, Essex CO7 6HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 251381 subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule 1: Appeal A Conditions.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for 'replacement of the existing dormer windows, replacement roof tiles, re rendering and other associated works' at Little House, High Street, Dedham, Essex CO7 6HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 251382 and the plans submitted with it; 100 Rev P10 (Site Plan and OS Plan), 010020 Rev P14 (Proposed Lower Ground and Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan), 030 Rev P16 (Proposed First and Second Floor Plan), 040 Rev P18 (Proposed Sections), 050 Rev P20 (Proposed Road and Rear Elevations) and 060 Rev P12 (Side Elevation Proposed); subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule 2: Appeal B Conditions.

Application for Costs

3. An application for costs was made by Bobby Jennings and Melissa Herring against Colchester City Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. The appeal site includes a Grade II listed building, 'The Little House' which is located within the Dedham Conservation Area ('the CA'). There are also a number of listed buildings in the vicinity of the site, although the Council has only referred specifically to the neighbouring Grade II* listed building 'Great House'. In view of this context, I have been mindful of the duties at sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 ('the Act') in determining the appeals.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:
 - i) the effect of the proposal on the special interest of the Grade II listed building, The Little House (Appeals A and B);
 - ii) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Dedham CA (Appeals A and B); and
 - iii) the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II* listed building, Great House (Appeal A only).

Reasons

6. The Little House is a two-storey over basement house with further accommodation at roof level. It has a plastered exterior with arched windows and a doorway to the ground-floor front elevation beneath tall first-floor windows with decorative low window guards, and a steeply pitched tiled roof with dormers to the front and rear slopes. The list entry indicates that the building dates to the early 19th Century but that part of the house was damaged by fire and then restored, and the appellant's Heritage Statement includes historic photos illustrating that there have been notable alterations to the roof level including removal of a parapet. It is suggested that this occurred following the fire, and that the current roof structure is early 20th Century in date.
7. The existing dormers are offset slightly from the fenestration below and are in somewhat poor condition. Nevertheless, the otherwise regular arrangement of features, the proportions of the building and retained detailing which is typical of the Regency period remain legible. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, I find the special interest of The Little House to be primarily associated with the historic and architectural interest deriving from its proportions and the quality of its detailing which provide for an attractively elegant building.
8. Great House was built in 1937-38 to the designs of Raymond Erith. It is a large three-storey house with a brick exterior, a shallow hipped roof, and features including jalousies to windows and a shallow portico with Ionic columns to the entrance which is positioned centrally beneath a lunette window. The list entry records that the building has architectural interest as an embodiment of Erith's ideas of how classicism could be adapted to suit modern middle-class lifestyles and insofar as it relates to Appeal A, I find the special interest of the listed building to be primarily associated with the quality of its detailing and its historic and architectural interest as an example of Erith's interpretation of early 19th century classical architecture.

9. The appeal site is immediately adjacent to Great House. Insofar as its architectural quality complements that of the neighbouring listed building, I find in respect of Appeal A that the appeal dwelling makes some contribution to the significance of Great House as part of its setting.
10. The Dedham CA encompasses much of the rural village of Dedham, and includes a large number of historic buildings, many of which are listed, dating back to the late medieval period, as well as surrounding areas of open space. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, the quality of the historic buildings, the use of vernacular materials and the form and pattern of the village are all elements that contribute to the character and appearance of the CA and thus its significance. As one of the many historic buildings fronting the High Street through the village, I find the appeal dwelling to make a positive contribution to the character, appearance and significance of the CA.

Effects of the Proposal

11. The National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework') sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It further advises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.
12. As part of the proposal, the existing dormers to the front and rear roofslopes of the building would be replaced. The Council has not objected to the removal of the existing dormers which are not contemporaneous with the building and given their style and detailing and the evidence before me, I see no reason to find that their loss would be unacceptable.
13. The replacement dormers would have wider cheeks and a greater build up to their roofs than the existing dormers. This detailing would give an impression of bulk and heaviness at odds with the slender framing that is more typical of traditional dormer designs, more characteristic of modern development. That said, the scale of the cheeks and roof would be apparent, but would not in my view be so substantial as to stand out significantly.
14. Moreover, the detailing of the cheeks and roof profile would not be appreciated or experienced in isolation. In this case, the replacement dormers would each be of notably lesser overall width than the existing features and only very slightly greater depth. They would be taller, but only very slightly so to the front and not significantly so to the rear, so that their impression of scale and bulk would be reduced overall. Their reduced width in particular would moderate their visual impact within the host roofslopes and despite the greater bulk of their cheeks and roofs, I find the dormers would overall be no more visually heavy or overbearing against the building than the existing features.
15. The replacement dormers would also lack uPVC gutters and downpipes which are currently part of the existing dormers and which appear incongruous against the traditional form and materials of the host building. In this respect, they would be more sympathetically detailed than the existing features. Furthermore, the offset of the existing dormers from the windows below appears somewhat awkward, particularly against the otherwise formal order and regular arrangement of the building's front elevation. In contrast, the proposed dormers would align with the windows below, better respecting and complementing the elegant composition of

the elevations. Their finish would also be likely to offer a visual enhancement relative to the existing render which is in somewhat poor condition.

16. In my view, these aspects of the proposed dormers would offer enhancements in comparison to those to be replaced which would outweigh the adverse effect of the cheek and roof profile detailing such that they would be no less sympathetic than the existing dormers overall. As a consequence, I find on balance that the replacement dormers taken as a whole would have a neutral effect on the special interest of the host listed building. For the same reasons, I find that the contribution that the building currently makes to the CA and, in respect of Appeal A, to the significance of Great House as part of the setting of this listed building would be maintained overall.
17. Furthermore, the Council has not raised concerns about other aspects of the proposal. These include re-laying of the roof with handmade clay tiles in place of the existing pantiles and the replacement of uPVC rainwater goods with cast metal features. Insofar as these materials would more closely reflect the historic character of the building, I find that there would be enhancement to the appearance of the host listed building and its special interest. The replacement of cracked render would also enhance the building's appearance and special interest. In these respects, the proposal would offer an overall heritage benefit to the significance of the listed building and the contribution that it makes to the significance of the CA and, in respect of Appeal A, to Great House.
18. Based on my observations and the evidence before me, I am additionally satisfied that the remaining aspects of the proposal including replacement of a modern chimneypiece, replacement fascia and eaves boards and replacement windows to the side gable would at least preserve the special interest of the host and neighbouring listed buildings and the character and appearance of the CA.
19. Drawing these matters together, I find that the bulk and design of the cheeks and roofs to the replacement dormers would be at odds with the traditional character of the appeal building. However, while I appreciate that derogation from current Building Regulation standards may be possible in the case of a listed building, the Council has provided no compelling evidence to dispute the appellant's case that reducing the cheeks and roof profile would make providing reasonable levels of insulation and ventilation to the dormers impractical.
20. Furthermore, the detailing of the dormer cheeks and roofs would be offset by enhancements related to the overall scale and positioning of the dormers and lack of unsympathetic rainwater goods. As a whole, the effect of the replacement dormers on the special interest of the building would be neutral. Effects on the setting and significance of Great House and on the character and the appearance of the CA would similarly be neutral. There would additionally be further enhancement to the special interest of the listed building and the contribution that it makes to the CA and to Great House as part of its setting through the replacement of roof tiles and rainwater goods and re-rendering which would provide an overall heritage benefit.
21. Taking these factors together, I conclude that the proposal would at least preserve the special interest and significance of the Grade II listed building, The Little House, and the character, appearance and significance of the Dedham CA. In respect of Appeal A, it would also preserve the setting and significance of the Grade II* listed

building, Great House. This would satisfy the requirements of the Act, and the Framework insofar as it seeks conservation and enhancement of heritage assets. I further find no conflict with Policies ENV1 or DM16 of the Colchester Local Plan 2017-2033 which include requirements broadly seeking conservation and enhancement of Colchester's historic environment and heritage assets. Nor with Policies SP7 or DM15 of the Local Plan which are not cited in the reasons for refusal but which are referenced in the Council's evidence and which include requirements broadly for development to respect and respond positively to local character, to protect and enhance assets of historical value and to preserve and enhance the quality of places.

Other Matters

22. The appeal site is located within the Dedham Vale National Landscape ('the NL') where section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended) outlines a statutory duty to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area. Given the location of the appeal site within the built up area of Dedham and my findings above that the proposal would at least preserve the significance of the host and neighbouring listed buildings and the CA, I am satisfied that the natural beauty of the NL would be conserved.

Conditions

23. I have considered suggested conditions against the tests set out in the Framework. I have made amendments where necessary to ensure compliance with these tests, for clarity, brevity or consistency or to avoid duplication.
24. In addition to standard conditions specifying the time limits, I have imposed a condition in respect of Appeal A specifying the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. This is unnecessary in Appeal B, as the decision incorporates the plans.
25. In order to preserve the character and appearance of the building I have imposed conditions on Appeal A requiring further details of the proposed materials, render, joinery and rainwater goods; specifying that external joinery should be timber; and requiring that any adjoining surfaces disturbed by the works are made good. Because the proposal would need to be implemented complying with the conditions on Appeal B, it would not be necessary in this case to impose duplicate conditions on Appeal A. In addition, construction working hours would be subject to control under other legislation. I have not therefore imposed a suggested condition on Appeal A seeking to restrict working hours as this would not be necessary.

Conclusion

26. For the reasons given above, the Appeal A proposal would accord with the development plan when it is read as a whole. Material considerations do not indicate that a decision contrary to the development plan should be reached, and I conclude that the appeals should each be allowed.

J Bowyer

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE 1: APPEAL A CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 100 Rev P10 (Site Plan and OS Plan), 010020 Rev P14 (Proposed Lower Ground and Proposed Upper Ground Floor Plan), 030 Rev P16 (Proposed First and Second Floor Plan), 040 Rev P18 (Proposed Sections), 050 Rev P20 (Proposed Road and Rear Elevations) and 060 Rev P12 (Side Elevation Proposed).

SCHEDULE 2: APPEAL B CONDITIONS

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) No external facing or roofing materials shall be used in the carrying out of the works hereby permitted until precise details of their manufacturer, types and colours have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 3) No external render shall be used in the carrying out of the works hereby permitted until a specification for this render including the number of coats, mix, finish, backing material and relationship to existing finishes has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved specification.
- 4) No works to windows shall be carried out until details of all new external window joinery have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include depth of reveal, details of heads, sills and lintels, elevations at a scale of not less than 1:10 and horizontal/vertical frame sections (including sections through glazing bars) at not less than 1:2. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 5) No works to rainwater goods (gutters, downpipes, hopperheads and soil pipes) shall be carried out until details of proposed cast metal goods including their material, colour and profile have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 6) Within three months of the works hereby permitted being carried out, all adjoining surfaces disturbed by the works (including brickwork, plaster and floor tiles) shall be made good with materials and finishes to match those of existing surrounding undisturbed areas.

End of Schedule