



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2021

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/21/3269934
12 Norfolk Road, Maldon CM9 6AZ

- 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 Simon Mercer against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/20/00897, dated 1 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2020.
 - The proposed development is for demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi detached two storey house likely dating from around the 1960s or 70's. The property consists of white timber horizontal boarding and brick vertical piers and these materials are generally consistent along this part of Norfolk Road where there are several similar housetypes. Alongside the property is a public footpath that runs to the rear of the house and connects Norfolk Road to Norfolk Close and to its frontage the front of the property is largely open to the street.
4. The proposal seeks permission for a two storey side extension to replace the existing garage to the side, a single storey extension to the rear to serve as a family room and a small porch to the front. The proposal will sit flush to the front elevation of the main house at first floor and protrude somewhat at ground floor level.
5. In assessing this appeal I am guided by Policy D1 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan that places considerable emphasis upon the importance of good design including architectural style and the contribution that development can have upon the character and appearance of an area.

6. In this case, the proposed side extension will be designed in such a way as to appear contemporary with the main house and the proposal would not include a set down or set back of the extension so as to set it apart or to reduce the potential risk of a terracing effect being developed.
7. In considering the impact of this change I consider that the semi detached nature of this part of Norfolk Road is a positive characteristic to be responded to and although there are some properties where the uniform nature of these houses have been modified, I consider that side extensions that may create the appearance of a terrace form would be harmful to the appearance of the street as a whole.
8. In terms of the oblique angle of the extension to the side I do consider that a more appropriate design response alongside the public right of way would provide a more positive relationship to this footpath, however, I consider that the set back into the property's boundary and suitable boundary treatment would be sufficient to minimise this harm. Similarly I find no harm to the character of the area through the single storey rear extension.
9. The appellant has directed my attention to several other examples of extensions nearby that are not subservient and I saw on my site visit that there are some other properties which have extended or been modified in a similar manner. However, I consider that some of these developments likely occurred some time ago and, moreover, I have no information before me as to the reasons or background to these developments. As such I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same as the case before me. Nonetheless, I consider that further such changes would have the potential to cause harm to the character and appearance of the area through compounding the potential of a terrace effect being developed.
10. In light of the information before me therefore I consider that the proposal is contrary to Policy D1 of the Maldon Local Development Plan due to it creating a harmful terrace effect.

Other Matters

11. Due to the protrusion of the proposed porch and side extension beyond the front of the property there is a risk of there not being sufficient parking provision for vehicles owned by occupants of the house. I consider that there may well be a risk of vehicles being parked on the highway for convenience at certain times.
12. However I also consider that the remaining space of 5.6m is only slightly short of the space needed to park a car and that vehicles would be able to manoeuvre into the curtilage of the property effectively within this depth. As such I consider that the dimensions and practicality of the space are enough to accommodate vehicles within the amount of area available without compromising highway safety.
13. As such I consider that the provision of adequate storage for bicycles within the garage and adequate space for vehicles will remain to such an extent as to ensure recommendations for accessibility contained within the Supplementary Planning Document on Vehicle Parking standards will be met.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR