

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: 21 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/17/3171464

4 Railway Cottages, Station Road, Althorne, Chelmsford CM3 6DG

- 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 J & T Woods and Connolly against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/16/01250, dated 21 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side and single storey front and rear extensions.
-

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 building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey semi-detached house with a single-storey rear wing. It mirrors the appearance of its attached pair forming a symmetrical and attractive composition, a matter to which I attach substantial weight. The property is located in a rural environment close to a small railway station and a level crossing.
 4. The proposal would include a part single storey and part 2-storey side extension. This would be subordinate in height to the host building and complementary in appearance. Although the 2-storey element would be set back behind the front elevation, the side addition as a whole would add substantial bulk to the property in a very exposed location resulting in severe disruption to the symmetry and unity of the semi-detached pair. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.
 5. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies BE1 and BE6 of the Maldon District Replacement Local Plan (2005) and Policy D1 of the emerging Maldon District Local Development Plan which, amongst other matters, seek development that is compatible with its surroundings. There is also conflict
-

with the broad aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2011) in this regard.

Other matters

6. The appellant has raised concerns about how this planning application and the earlier one were handled by the Council. As these are matters that do not relate to the planning merits of the proposal I attribute limited weight to them.

Conclusion

7. Although I note that the scheme has been revised following a previous refusal, for the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR