



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by Neil Smith BA Hons BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/19/3230465

48 Glebe Way, Burnham-on-Crouch, Essex CM0 8QJ

- 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 T Grimes against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00350, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side/rear extension and replacement roof to create first floor accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for a single storey side/rear extension and replacement roof to create first floor accommodation at 48 Glebe Way, Burnham-on-Crouch, Essex CM0 8QJ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00350 dated 22 March 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 18-48GW-03 Location Plan; 18-48-04 Rev A Site Plan; 18-GW-05 Existing Plans and Elevations and; 18-48GW-06 Rev C Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a single storey bungalow and a detached garage. It is in a predominantly residential area with the adjoining dwellings also being detached. The dwellings along Glebe Way vary in both size and style including bungalows and two storey detached dwellings some dwellings with individual character. The appeal site is at the end of a run of several similar bungalows on one side and is immediately adjacent to a two-storey dwelling at No 46 Glebe Way. On the opposite side of the street are two-storey detached dwellings which are of different design.

4. The dwellings are set back from the street with front gardens and driveways serving individual garages. The front elevations follow the gentle bend of the street. The location of the garages in the street varies, with some projecting forward of the front elevations of the dwellings and others set back. Together with the absence of any significant boundary treatments to the front of the dwellings, the area is largely open in character.
5. The appeal proposal seeks the removal of the existing conservatory and the erection of a side/rear extension together with a replacement roof to create first floor accommodation. The side extension will incorporate an integral garage and would be set further away from the side boundary than the existing garage. The rear extension would project less than two metres from the main rear elevation of the host property. I consider that these extensions would maintain the open character of the area and I also note that the Council raise no objections to these elements of the appeal proposal if considered in isolation.
6. The proposed porch and integral garage would be set further forward of the existing front elevation by about 1 metre. I do not find that this forward projection would harm the street scene or be unduly prominent as it would still have a generous set back from the street edge. The forward projection would also be relatively modest and follows the bend of the street.
7. The accommodation at first floor level would require the roof to be raised to accommodate three bedrooms and two bathrooms. The roof would also cover the side and rear elevations and be raised in height. Whilst the expanse of the roof would be enlarged, most of the increase would not be visible from the street scene. The enlarged roof has been sensitively designed with the introduction of a jerkinhead roof to reduce its bulk. I also find that the modest increase in the height of the roof is not out of proportion with either the host dwelling or the neighbouring dwellings. This is because it would still maintain the same eaves height and would be a gentle rise in height from the run of bungalows to the adjacent two-storey dwelling.
8. Whilst the appeal dwelling is similar in design to the others in the run of bungalows, I do not consider that its resultant individual style would be out of keeping. This is due to the prevalence of differing house types in the street and because the appeal proposal would continue the architectural features which are common within the locality. The appeal development also proposes to use materials to match the existing dwelling and I have attached a condition in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
9. It has been brought to my attention that a similar development was granted planning permission to the rear of the appeal site at 16 St Mary's Road. I note that the Council states that St Mary's Road displays a greater variation of dwelling styles than Glebe Way where the impact is not as great. From my site visit I saw that Glebe Way also has many differing house designs and I do not consider that the impact of the appeal proposal to be harmful.
10. I note the reason for refusal does not state the relevant policy in the Burnham on Crouch Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) however it is clear in the Officers Report that Policy HO.8 is identified.
11. For the reasons outlined above I consider that the appeal proposal would accord with policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan

(2017) and policy HO.8 of the Burnham-on-Crouch Neighbourhood Development Plan (2017) which together seek to respect and enhance the character and local context of the area.

Other Matters

12. I recognise that the neighbours at 16 St Mary's Road have raised objections regarding overlooking and loss of privacy. I have considered these matters and I do not consider that the appeal proposals would cause any harm to the living conditions to this neighbouring property.

Conclusion

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interest of certainty. A condition concerning external materials is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons above the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted subject to the conditions identified.

Neil Smith

INSPECTOR