

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 June 2017

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/17/3173360

7 Cedar Grove, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex CM0 8DQ

- 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 Ms Angelique Bell against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/16/01415 was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the relocation of front entrance. Proposed internal re-configurations. Proposed pitched roof dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached chalet bungalow with a rear dormer. It lies within a predominately residential area comprising groups of bungalows and two-storey dwellings. There are a number of rear dormers in the vicinity, but no front dormers in this part of Cedar Grove.
 4. Rear flat roof dormers are visible within the streetscene. The proposal before me includes one front pitched roof dormer with the gable end extending out from the existing steep pitched roof of the dwelling. Due to its style, design, size and position, I consider that it would appear as an incongruous addition that would unbalance the roofslope to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. In such a prominent position, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene, where such front dormers are not an overriding characteristic and where pitched roof dormers with prominent gables are not present.
 5. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised, including examples of other dormers in the vicinity, especially in Beech Close and Maple Way. In addition, I note that planning permission has recently been granted for two front dormers at 4 Cedar Grove. None of these are identical to the
-

proposed pitched roof dormer for my consideration, which I have determined on its individual merits.

6. The proposal includes the relocation of the front entrance. The Council has not raised concern regarding the front entrance. From my observations, this would be a discrete alteration which would be in keeping with the existing character and appearance of the surrounding streetscene. However, as this is reliant on internal reconfiguration and thus cannot be undertaken independently from the proposed front dormer, it is not appropriate to issue a split decision in this respect.
7. For the reasons stated above, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved policies BE1 and BE6 in the Maldon District Replacement Local Plan (2005), where they seek to ensure that new development is compatible with the surroundings. I consider that these policies are broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework as far as they meet the Framework's core principles; particularly that planning should be seeking to ensure high quality design and should be taking account of the different roles and character of an area.
8. I have been referred to Policy D1 in the emerging Local Development Plan 2014-2029. As this may be subject to future amendment, I have attributed it limited weight in my determination of this appeal.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR