

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2019

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/19/3236681

10 Seagers, Great Totham, Maldon, Essex, CM9 8PB

- 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 L Warner against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00408, dated 5 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension and single storey rear extension at 10 Seagers, Great Totham, Maldon, Essex, CM9 8PB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00408, dated 5 April 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: LW01Rev2, LW02Rev3(Sheet 2) & LW02Rev3(Sheet 3).

Preliminary Matters

2. I use the Council's description of development which is more precise than the application form and more concise than the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is detached two storey dwelling sited side-on off the end of a cul de sac. The character is of an established residential good quality area and the scene is pleasing with a variety of house types with a number built in
-

an arrangement with gable ends close to the roadside. The proposal is as described above. The gable fronted pitched roof front extension would project about 4.2 metres from the main wall, have a width of about half the frontage, and have eaves and ridge heights in line with the host property. The small flat roofed rear extension would have a footprint of about 9 square metres.

5. The Council is, to my mind understandably, not concerned with proposed rear extension. However it sees the front extension as cause for concern because there would be dominance and incongruity through positioning, scale and design impacting on immediate and wider character and appearance.
6. I recognise that there would be appreciable change to the front elevation of this home and this variation, in side view mainly, would be clearly apparent in the streetscene. However I note above that the scene already encompasses gable features as main elements. Furthermore if one was to take these as a building line the scheme would not project forward. I am also cognisant that at times enclosure to the end of a cul de sac is an urban design approach with merit. The existing front, and indeed side, elevations of this home have no special aesthetic qualities and a blank end faces down the street which would have some interest added by means of two windows. The use of matching eaves and ridge heights can be an acceptable design solution on occasions and I am not convinced that in this instance of 'remodelling' a home it would be necessary to show complete subservience which is often rightly called for with extensions. This is an unusual situation all round given the character of the surrounds and the relative positioning of the existing property and a pragmatic approach can be taken.
7. In summary whilst the planned development would be very evident I am not persuaded that this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property or the streetscene. It would not be jarring on the eye.
8. Policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan are relevant. Taken together, and amongst other matters, they call for well designed development which would reflect local character, respect context, be of a suitable scale and complement the existing building. I conclude that the appeal scheme would not run contrary to these policies.

Conditions

9. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition along with the requirement for materials to match the existing building. I agree this latter condition would be appropriate in the interests of visual amenity. I also agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

Overall conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly the appeal is allowed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR