
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/19/3227822

14 Chandlers, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex CM0 8NY

- 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 Mrs Audrey Beagle against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00250 was refused by notice dated 24 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension and first floor extension over the existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the first floor extension over the existing garage. The appeal is allowed in so far as it relates to the single-storey rear extension. Planning permission is granted for a single-storey rear extension at 14 Chandlers, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex CM0 8NY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00250 dated 27 February 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Map, AB01, AB02 and AB03, in so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

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 dwelling is a detached two-storey dwelling at the end of a cul-de-sac in a modern development. A distinct characteristic of this area is the coherent overall design of this modern development. The appeal property and

No. 25 Chandlers are dwellings that mirror each other at the end of the cul-de-sac with the single-storey double garages providing a gap at first floor level. This creates a sense of spaciousness in an otherwise high density development. I consider this spaciousness makes a positive contribution to the streetscene in this prominent location.

4. The proposal includes a first floor extension over part of the double garage, extending forward an existing roof line. From my observations, due to the scale, siting and design of the proposed first floor extension, I consider that it would appear as an unacceptably dominant addition. It would appear as a disproportionate addition and would unbalance the uniformity of this part of the streetscene. In such a prominent position, this would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider streetscene.
5. In reaching my conclusion, I have had regard to all matters raised including the dormer window above a garage on a property at the entrance to Chandlers. This is not directly comparable to the proposal before me, particularly as this is not the same scale and design as the proposal before me and is not positioned in the streetscene to mirror a neighbouring property. I have determined the proposal before me on its individual merits.
6. I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. Thus, the proposed first floor extension would be contrary to policies D1 and H4 in the Maldon District Approved Local Development Plan 2014 – 2029 (adopted in 2017), where they seek to ensure that new development respects and enhances the character and local context and makes a positive contribution. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.

Single-Storey Rear Extension

7. The Council has not raised concern regarding the proposed single-storey rear extension. The existing conservatory would be removed and replaced with a staggered rear extension over much of the width of the dwelling. From my observations, due to its scale, depth and design, this would be a subservient addition which would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. For the same reasons, I do not consider this proposal would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbours.
8. As the proposed single-storey rear extension would be clearly severable from the proposed first-floor extension, I consider it appropriate to issue a split decision in this respect.
9. The Council has suggested the imposition of standard time, materials and plans conditions. I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose such conditions.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR