

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/17/3171681

Amaethon, Grange Road, Tillingham, Southminster CM0 7UR

- 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 Dr & Mrs Mike & Claire North against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/16/01397, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding countryside.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached 2-storey house located in the corner of a large plot of land with a detached garage to the front and outbuildings to the rear. It is located in the countryside on a road that includes a small number of houses of similar appearance and relatively modest size.
 4. The proposal would comprise the erection of a part single and part 2-storey timber-clad side extension. This would essentially double the width of the house. Although it would be set back behind the main front building line and have a lower ridge level than the existing, it would significantly increase the overall bulk of the property and would be a disproportionate addition to it.
 5. In this rural location the proposed enlarged dwelling would be an overly prominent and incongruous form of development that would be out of keeping with its surroundings. For these reasons I conclude that due to its size and siting the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding countryside.
 6. I note that there is scope for enhanced landscaping within and close to the boundaries of the appeal site. This would have limited screening benefits in the short term and would not in any case overcome the impact of the proposal on the open character of this sparsely developed area of countryside or on the
-

appearance of the property. Whilst I recognise that the use of contrasting materials can be an appropriate design approach for extension, doing so in this particular instance does not overcome the impacts identified above.

7. I recognise the appellants' personal circumstances and desire to have a hydrotherapy pool, gym, mobility shower and ground level bedroom. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the scale and siting of development proposed – which includes 2 additional bedrooms and a sun room – is necessary to meet the specific needs referred to. I therefore attribute limited weight to these matters.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal fails to comply with Policies BE1 and BE6 of the Maldon District Replacement Local Plan (2005) and Policy D1 of the emerging Maldon District Local Development Plan. Amongst other matters these policies seek development that is compatible with its surroundings. There is also conflict with the broad aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2011).

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR