
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 21 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/16/3161558
43 Suffolk Road, Maldon, Essex CM9 6AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Philip Mouser against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/16/00102, dated 1 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as front first floor extensions over existing addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for front first floor extension over existing addition at 43 Suffolk Road, Maldon, Essex CM9 6AX in accordance with the terms of the application, HOUSE/MAL/16/00102 , dated 1 February 2016 subject to the conditions below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:415/01, 415/02B, 415/03A, 415/04A, 415/05D, 415/06D

Preliminary matter

2. The description of the development on the application form refers to front first floor extensions. However there is only one extension proposed and therefore I have amended the description in my decision accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 43 Suffolk Road is a semi-detached property sited within a residential estate of similar houses. They are set back from the road with open gardens to the front. Although the dwellings are of comparable designs a large number have been altered, primarily through the addition of a single storey front extension. Some are flat roofed extensions, the majority though are larger and extend to beneath the first floor window significantly altering the exterior form of the
-

front elevation of the properties. As a result the uniformity of the original appearance of the estate has been eroded and accordingly the area has a mixed character and appearance with little regular rhythm.

5. The proposed extension would be erected above the existing ground floor, the roof of which is located just below the first floor window. As a result it would not project any further forward than the existing front elevation of the building. While it would extend across the entire width of the building its gable elevation would sit below the ridge of the main roof and therefore would be subordinate to it.
6. As a result of the limited extent and height of the extension it would not be particularly prominent within the street scene, especially given the existing mixed character and appearance of the area. Furthermore, I saw a similar extension at 22 Norfolk Road which is within view of the appeal site. Consequently the proposed extension would not be unique or unacceptable within the street scene.
7. For the reasons above I conclude that the proposed extension would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be in accordance with saved Policies BE1 and BE6 of the Maldon District Replacement Local Plan 2005, emerging Policy D1 of the Maldon District Pre Submission Local Development Plan 2014-2029 and the National Planning Policy Framework. These require that development should respect and be compatible with the character, local context and surroundings reflecting local distinctiveness.

Conditions

8. I have had regard to the planning conditions that have been suggested by the Council and considered them against the tests in the Framework and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance. As a result I have not imposed a condition regarding materials as it is clearly marked on plan 415/06D that they would match those existing.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR