



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th February 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/19/3239571

Melba, Whitehouse Farm, Ferry Road, North Fambridge, Essex CM3 6LS

- 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 Ms Kelly Richardson against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00671, dated 6 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is part two storey, part single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached property set within a generous plot and located outside the village of North Fambridge. The dwelling has a modest design with a half hip roof, a car port acting as a first floor balcony to one side and a linked annexe to the other. The dwelling is located some distance from neighbouring properties and is accessed from an unmade private road that leads from Ferry Road through Whitehouse Farm. The front of the house is visible from the access road albeit views are localised.
4. The proposed development would extend across the entire front elevation in the form of a part two story, part single storey extension and would be part of a remodelling of the dwelling.
5. Based on the policies referred to by the Council I acknowledge that there is no specific requirement for the extension to be subservient to the host property. However, the appeal scheme would extend the building considerably particularly at ground floor level and would not be of an appropriate scale when considering the size of the host property. Whilst I acknowledge that the property is located within a reasonably secluded location and views of the building are localised, the scale and bulk of the proposal would be unduly dominant and prominent.

6. The use of differing roof designs would unacceptably jar with the architecture of the host property and would diminish the character of it. The impact of the scheme would be to detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the host building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area.
7. As such I find that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (2017) which, amongst other things, requires new development to be of an appropriate scale and design and make a positive contribution to the character of the original building and the surrounding area.

Other Matters

8. The lack of opposition from neighbours counts neither for nor against the proposal and does not overcome the harm I have identified in relation to the main issue.
9. My attention has been drawn to an extension allowed at appeal nearby at 'Corner Cottage'. From the details before me, it appears that the merits and circumstances of the scheme are materially different to those of the appeal proposal, namely that it replaces existing buildings on site and the proposed roof would respect the form of the existing dwelling. In any event, every appeal must be considered on its own merits. This example does not justify the harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR