



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 7 June 2021

by Robin Buchanan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/21/3266562

21 Glebe Road, Heybridge, Maldon CM9 4AR

- 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 and Mrs Lee Heeley against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/20/00865, dated 25 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. In the description of development in the banner heading above, I have omitted wording in the application form which is not itself development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed first floor side and rear extension would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The host building is the left-hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. It is typical of the houses in Glebe Road and is similar to many others in the surrounding residential area, which are generally simple rectangular blocks of built form below hipped main roofs. The street scene is characterised by these reasonably evenly spaced pairs of houses aligned in an ordered manner along roads, with open spaces between them at ground level or gaps over single storey garages or side extensions, as at the host building. This allows views past the houses towards more distant buildings or hedges and trees or the sky, which gives a spacious feel to the area and is locally distinctive.
5. The development would substantially enlarge the host building at first floor level to the rear and to one side, above the existing single storey flat roofed extension. Part of the rear extension would be hidden behind the existing house. However, its flat roof would be reasonably large in area and extent and the narrow lean-to roofs at either end, which would be conspicuous in views on one side from Glebe Road and have a tenuous link to the hipped pitched roof at

- the front, would be intrinsically at odds with the prevailing main roof form of the host building and other houses in the area above ground floor level.
6. Despite a subservient hipped roof form and its set back from the front elevation of the host building, the front part of the side extension would nonetheless add considerable bulk at first floor level. In addition, the significant projection in depth behind would add further substantial bulk at this height beyond the rear elevation of the existing house. Moreover, the one and half storey height of this part of the side extension, including a large area of blank elevation with narrow windows, would be out of keeping with the appearance of the host building and others nearby. It would also unduly emphasise the significant increase and excessive scale and massing of the side extension above the ground floor flat roof side extension and would be close to the common boundary with the neighbouring house.
 7. Consequently, the development would unduly erode the gap and space between the host building and the neighbouring house as viewed from Glebe Road directly from the front, and also behind the host building, as viewed at an angle from one side from the curved part of Glebe Road and in a longer distance view from the junction of Glebe Road with Towers Road. It would therefore also result in a conspicuously more built-up and overly terraced appearance to development that would be incongruous in Glebe Road and in the surrounding residential area.
 8. The appellants have referred me to some other houses in Glebe Road with two storey side extensions. I saw that No 1 includes a hipped roof just below the ridge height of the main roof. However, this extension does not appear to project in any appreciable depth to the rear and, moreover, this house is at one end of Glebe Road, on an open corner plot. This extension does not therefore have a significant affect on spaciousness in the streetscene or in relation to the neighbouring house in Towers Road, which faces a different way and is a reasonable distance from No 1. The extension at No 10 includes a gabled roof to the side (end) elevation. However, it also appears to have limited depth at the rear and No 10 is sited almost in a straight line to the neighbouring house, which maintains an appreciable degree of openness and views between.
 9. The extension at No 14 has a hipped roof but it does not project to the rear at the same width as at the front, being stepped in and away from the neighbouring house as a sequence of narrower end elevations. Moreover, these houses are sited on the inside curve of the road at a significant angle to each other which retains greater openness at the front. Whereas in this appeal the proposed side extension steps out and towards the neighbouring house and the host building is sited on the outside curve in the road, angled in and towards the neighbouring house reducing space at the front.
 10. The appellants also refer to a planning permission for a 'full height' two storey side extension granted by the Council at No 16. I do not have any details of that development before me, including whether it extends in any appreciable depth to the rear. Nonetheless, I note that this house is also on the inside curve in the road so it orientates away from the front elevation of the neighbouring house at No 18. Moreover, there is a large gap between the siting of these respective houses, including a vehicular access track. In addition, on the evidence before me, the loft extension at No 15, which includes a gabled roof alteration, was undertaken as permitted development. While it has a

relatively wide flat roof at a high level, it does not extend in depth beyond the rear elevation of the house and only a small part is visible from Glebe Road.

11. Considering the above, I find that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area. In these regards it would not accord with Policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan, July 2017. These policies seek to ensure that development respects the surrounding local context, including character of the existing building, and in terms of architectural style, detailed design, height, size, scale, form, massing, townscape setting, layout and orientation and that it contributes positively to the public realm and enhances local distinctiveness.
12. It would also conflict with Framework paragraphs 124, 127(a), (b), (c) and (d) and 170 which include that development should create high quality buildings and places that add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout, be sympathetic to local character, maintain a strong sense of place and enhance the local environment.

Other Matters

13. The appeal site contains a tree which is protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO)¹. It is located towards the end of the rear garden, some distance from the host building, and I am therefore satisfied that it would not be adversely affected by the development. I note that the Council did not object for this reason.
14. I have taken account of the appellants' personal objectives in seeking to establish a suitably sized family home. While I sympathise with the appellants' needs in this regard, I have borne in mind that the development would remain long after these personal circumstances have ceased to be material. Therefore, these considerations do not outweigh the harm that I have identified above
15. I appreciate that the appeal proposal is a revised scheme and that the appellants consider that it overcomes the Council's previous concerns. I also note the absence of public objection, but that does not mean the absence of material planning harm. I have, in any event, determined the appeal on its planning merits.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is unsuccessful.

Robin Buchanan

INSPECTOR

¹ Council's reference TPO No. 15/06