



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/25/3373521

101 Heywood Way, Heybridge, CM9 4BH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Emma Harvey-Bignell against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00622/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey rear wraparound extension and addition of front porch with alterations to the front elevation and dropped kerb.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The application site is located on the western side of Heywood Way within the settlement boundary of Heybridge. The site is occupied by a two storey semi-detached dwelling, that fronts onto a walkway with its side elevation facing the road. Its attached neighbour also fronts onto the walkway as do 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings opposite. The surrounding area is residential with dwellings of similar designs. Further to the west, beyond the end of the walkway is a large strategic development which is currently under construction and known as the North Heybridge Garden Suburb. There is a parking area to the south of the site that has capacity for about 9 cars.
4. The proposed 2-storey side extension would almost double the footprint of the appeal dwelling, extending close to the curtilage boundary with the parking area and Heywood Way. This side extension, running back some 6.2m, for most of the side elevation, would be under a hipped roof. The ridge of this roof would be below the existing roof ridge, although the front roof slope would run across the existing front slope of the house. On the front of the house, a single storey extension would run the whole length of the enlarged ground floor, under a sloping roof, with a gabled porch at the centre.
5. Turning to the proposed single storey rear wraparound extension, this would continue along the side from the point at which the 2-storey extension ends and then across the whole of the dwelling's extended footprint. This would be under a sloping roof with a hip at the point where it turns to cross the rear of the building.

Above this rear extension, at first floor level, would be an extension on the line of the existing rear elevation of the house, under a projecting gabled roof. This extension seems to have been missed off the description of the development.

6. The development would be highly visible from Heywood Way, including from the T-junction just to the north-east. The car parking area to the south-east would provide no effective screening, and the 1.8m vertical wooden fence would similarly be ineffective. The totality of the proposed additions would be out of scale with the dwelling and its attached neighbour, and would be incongruous in relation to the existing pair and to the streetscene. The blank flank elevation to Heywood Way would appear unattractive, adding to the unsatisfactory effect on the surroundings. In its context of semi-detached houses, for the most part retaining their original form, it would appear an outlandish development.
7. For the appellant it is emphasised that, among other matters, the site when considered as a whole is generous in size, benefitting from large front and rear gardens with the dwelling centrally positioned, and that there have been other front extensions in the immediate area, and comparisons are made with what can be built under permitted development rights. The extent of front and rear gardens does not have any real impact on or reduce the scale of the proposals. The proposed extensions do not amount to subservient development. The fact that permitted development rights would allow for some development is not persuasive since the proposal requires express consent and must be judged on its merits.
8. I have also taken account of the fact that the proposal incorporates annexe accommodation for elderly relatives, which it is said to be in accord with what is allowed under the Specialist Needs Housing Supplementary Planning Document, although I have not been provided with a copy of that document by either party. The fact that the annexe is ancillary to the main dwelling, sharing access, garden, and parking and would remain in the same ownership and curtilage as the host dwelling, and that it could be integrated back into the main dwelling in future, are not persuasive reasons to allow a development that harms the public domain to the extent that I have described. That is not to say that I dismiss the benefit of the accommodation that would be provided, but these are private benefits, and the development would remain long after the reasons for the proposal cease to exist.
9. For the reasons that I have set out above, the appeal will be dismissed.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR