



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/20/3251280

11 Aveley Way, Maldon, Essex CM9 6YQ

- 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 R Hutchings against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/01310, dated 10 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension over garage with internal alterations and single storey front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for first floor extension over garage with internal alterations and single storey front porch at 11 Aveley Way, Maldon, Essex CM9 6YQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/01310, dated 10 December 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 1281/20
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 11 Aveley Way is a two storey detached dwelling with an attached garage. The estate is characterised by detached two storey dwellings of differing designs and styles, which results in an organic form of development with each dwelling being sited in a slightly different position to the road. As such, the group of dwellings are not uniform or symmetrical, and this contributes to the overall variety of the street scene.

4. The proposed first floor extension would be constructed above and slightly forward of the existing single storey garage, with a cantilevered projection. Despite the cantilevered elevation, the front of the extension would be set back from the front wall of the host dwelling and the gable of the extension would have a lower roofline. In these ways the proposal would be subservient to the host property. Furthermore, use of matching materials, which could be secured by condition, would be in keeping with the host dwelling.
5. Whilst the proposed hipped roof form is not a feature of the host dwelling, other examples of hipped roofs are evident within the wider estate and therefore it would not appear incongruous when viewed within the context of the area. As a consequence, the extension would not be overly prominent.
6. The proposal includes the introduction of a dormer window over the existing entrance door with the addition of a single storey porch. The single storey porch would be in line with the front elevation of the dwelling, with an overhanging roof. The pitched roof design of the dormer and its modest proportions, having regard to the overall scale of the roof, result in a proposal which is subservient to the main roof.
7. Although the surrounding area is not characterised by dormer windows, the introduction of a dormer window and the overhanging roof of the porch would still contribute positively to the area, with its range of dwelling styles, heights and roof forms. The proposed single storey porch and dormer would contribute to the overall character of the area, and along with the other changes to the property would be sympathetic and proportionate additions that would not detract from the overall character and appearance of the host dwelling.
8. In conclusion, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal complies with policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Approved Local Development Plan 2014-2029 (2017) which requires development to maintain the character of the original building and the area and be of an appropriate scale and design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

G. Pannell
INSPECTOR