



**REPORT of
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS**

**to
CENTRAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
27 JUNE 2018**

Application Number	HOUSE/MAL/18/00579
Location	15 Suffolk Road, Maldon
Proposal	Proposed two storey side extension and front porch extension. Erection of 2.2m high boundary close boarded fence and concrete gravel boards and posts. Replace detached garage at rear.
Applicant	Mr P Rowden
Agent	Terence Wynn
Target Decision Date	06/07/2018
Case Officer	Louise Staplehurst, TEL: 01621 875706
Parish	MALDON WEST
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In by Councillor Mark Heard similar to other extensions nearby.

1. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the reasons as detailed in Section 8 of this report.

2. SITE MAP

Please see overleaf.

15 Suffolk Road Maldon Central Committee 18/00579



MALDON DISTRICT
COUNCIL

For reference purposes only.
No further copies may be made.
This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey
material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on
behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery
Office © Crown copyright.
Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright
and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
Maldon District Council 1000 8588 2014

www.maldon.gov.uk

Scale: 1:750
Organisation: Maldon District Council
Department: Department
Comments: FUL/MAL/18/00579
Date: 15/06/2018
MSA Number: 100018588

3. **SUMMARY**

3.1 **Proposal / brief overview, including any relevant background information**

3.1.1 The application site is located west of Suffolk Road, within the settlement boundary of Maldon. The site is a corner plot and comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling. The surrounding area is residential in nature with properties of a similar design.

3.1.2 Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension, a front porch extension, a boundary fence and a replacement detached garage.

3.1.3 The side extension will measure 4.1 metres wide at the front elevation and 4.4 metres wide at the rear, 9.3 metres deep, 4.5 metres high to the eaves and 7.5 metres tall overall. It would project 2.1 metres from the rear elevation. In terms of materials, the walls will be brickwork, the roof will use roof tiles and the windows and doors will be UPVC. All materials will match the existing.

3.1.4 The close boarded wooden fence will measure 1.8 metres along the shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling and 2.2 metres high along the highway boundary. It is noted that the fence is already in place.

3.1.5 The front porch will project out 1.1 metres and will measure 2 metres wide. It will measure 2.1 metres to the eaves and 3.3 metres to the ridge. The brickwork and tiles will match the existing.

3.1.6 The garage will replace the existing garage to the rear of the dwelling. It will measure 6.3 metres deep, 4.2 metres wide, with an eaves height of 2.4 metres and a height of 3.8 metres to the ridge.

3.1.7 The application follows a previous application for a two storey side extension, a boundary fence, a front porch and a replacement garage. The reason for refusal was:

'The two storey side extension, by reason of its design and bulk, is considered to be a visually incongruous and dominant addition, which is considered to detrimentally harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan.'

3.1.8 The only alteration in this application, from the previous refused application, is the change in roof style of the side extension, from a hipped roof to a gable roof. All external dimensions of the side extension have remained unaltered.

3.2 **Conclusion**

3.2.1 It is considered that the proposed porch, fence and garage are acceptable additions. Furthermore, the proposal is not considered to impact on residential amenity, parking or amenity space. However, the side extension, due to its large bulk and dominant nature, would cause harm to the visual amenity of the existing dwelling and surrounding area, and is considered to be an overdevelopment of the site. The

proposal is therefore contrary to policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan (LDP) and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

4. MAIN RELEVANT POLICIES

Members' attention is drawn to the list of background papers attached to the agenda.

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework 2012 including paragraphs:

- 56-68 Requiring Good Design

4.2 Maldon District Local Development Plan 2014 – 2029 approved by the Secretary of State:

- D1 Design Quality and Built Environment
- T2 Accessibility
- S1 Sustainable Development
- H4 Effective Use of Land

4.3 Relevant Planning Guidance / Documents:

- Car Parking Standards
- Essex Design Guide
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
- Maldon District Design Guide

5. MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Principle of Development

5.1.1 The principle of altering and extending the dwelling to provide facilities in association with residential accommodation is considered acceptable, in compliance with Policy D1 of the LDP. Other material planning considerations are discussed below.

5.2 Design and Impact on the Character of the Area

5.2.1 The planning system promotes high quality development through good inclusive design and layout, and the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities. Good design should be indivisible from good planning. Recognised principles of good design should be sought to create a high quality built environment for all types of development.

5.2.2 It should be noted that good design is fundamental to high quality new development and its importance is reflected in the NPPF. The NPPF states that:

"The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people".

“Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions”.

5.2.3 This principle has been reflected to the approved LDP. The basis of policy D1 of the approved LDP seeks to ensure that all development will respect and enhance the character and local context and make a positive contribution in terms of:-

- a) Architectural style, use of materials, detailed design features and construction methods. Innovative design and construction solutions will be considered where appropriate;
- b) Height, size, scale, form, massing and proportion;
- c) Landscape setting, townscape setting and skylines;
- d) Layout, orientation, and density;
- e) Historic environment particularly in relation to designated and non-designated heritage assets;
- f) Natural environment particularly in relation to designated and non-designated sites of biodiversity / geodiversity value; and
- g) Energy and resource efficiency.

5.2.4 There is similar support for high quality design and the appropriate layout, scale and detailing of development found within the Maldon District Design Guide (2017).

5.2.5 The only alteration in this application, from the previous refused application, is the change in roof style of the side extension, from a hipped roof to a gable roof. All external dimensions of the side extension have remained unaltered.

5.2.6 The proposed side extension is considered to be a large addition as it will measure over half the width of the existing dwelling. Its location on a corner plot exacerbates the visual impact of the extension, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area. The extension is set back from the principal elevation by 0.7 metres. However due to the width, it would appear as a dominant addition. The gable roof style is considered to be more in keeping with the streetscene. However, the dimensions have not been reduced and therefore it does not appear as a subservient addition. The change in roof style has improved the view of the principal elevation however the extension expanding the majority of the depth of the dwelling, and projecting to the rear, dominates the view looking towards the north elevation, particularly from the adjacent cul-de-sac.

5.2.7 It is considered that the change in roof style has not overcome the harm identified as the reason for refusal in the previous application.

5.2.8 It is noted that No. 1 Suffolk Road and No. 36 Suffolk Road have been subject to two storey side extensions, both granted permission in 1990. However these extensions are smaller in scale and do not project to the rear of the dwellings and therefore appear as subordinate additions which are more in keeping with the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the planning landscape has changed considerably since these developments were granted planning permission. It is therefore considered that these developments, which do not form the prevailing character of the area, should be attributed minimal weight in the determination of this application.

- 5.2.9 The porch is considered to be an acceptable addition to a dwelling. There are similar porches in the surrounding area and therefore it would not detrimentally impact on the streetscene to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application.
- 5.2.10 The garage will be located at the rear of the site and would be replacing an existing garage. The scale, design and layout of the garage is considered to be acceptable and therefore there is no objection to this element of the proposal.
- 5.2.11 The fence is considered to be an acceptable addition along the boundary of the site. It is noted that the fence is already in place, however dwellings in the surrounding area have similar wooden fences; namely No.35 Suffolk Road. Therefore the fence is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the streetscene. The concerns of Maldon Town Council are noted, but it is considered that the height is not objectionable in this case.
- 5.2.12 Overall, the proposed garage, porch and fence are considered to be acceptable however the side extension will result in a dominating addition, causing an overdevelopment of the site and therefore the proposal is contrary to policies D1 and H4 of the LDP.

5.3 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 5.3.1 The basis of policy D1 of the approved LDP seeks to ensure that development will protect the amenity of its surrounding areas taking into account privacy, overlooking, outlook, noise, smell, light, visual impact, pollution, daylight and sunlight. This is supported by section C07 of the Maldon District Design Guide (2017).
- 5.3.2 The neighbouring dwelling to the north, No.33 Suffolk Road, is located 10 metres from the proposed side extension. There will be two ground floor windows and one first floor window on the north elevation. Although the first floor window will face the neighbouring dwelling, it is not considered to materially increase overlooking when compared to the existing first floor window. The extension will not cause overlooking or overshadowing to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application. Due to the positioning of the proposed garage, porch and fence, they are not considered to impact on the residential amenity of this neighbour.
- 5.3.3 The neighbouring dwelling, No.13 Suffolk Road, adjoins the dwelling at the application site. The proposed side extension also projects to the rear of the dwelling. There is one ground floor glazed door, which would not cause unacceptable overlooking, and one first floor window on the south elevation facing the neighbouring dwelling, which would be subject to a condition requiring obscured glass, if this application were to be approved. Due to the extension being located 5.8 metres from the neighbouring dwelling; it is not considered to cause overlooking or overshadowing to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application.
- 5.3.4 The proposed side extension will have one ground floor window and one first floor window on the front elevation. Any outlook from these windows is not considered to materially worse than the existing windows on the principal elevation. Due to the distance from neighbouring properties across the road, the proposal is not considered to cause an unneighbourly form of development.

5.3.5 The neighbouring property of No.17 Suffolk Road is located south west of the application site. The proposed garage abuts the boundary with the neighbouring property. The proposed garage measures 3.8 metres to the ridge and will be situated forward of the neighbouring dwelling. There will be no windows on the south west garage elevation facing the neighbouring dwelling and there are no windows on the north east elevation of the neighbouring property. Therefore whilst projecting slightly further forward than the neighbouring dwelling, the proposal will not result in overshadowing or loss of privacy to an extent that would justify the refusal of the application. In this regard, it is noted that the neighbouring property is set at a slightly higher ground level which helps to reduce the impact of the proposed garage.

5.3.6 All other properties would be a substantial distance from the proposed development. It is consequently considered that the proposed development will not cause overlooking or have a harmful impact of the amenities of neighbouring residents and would therefore be in accordance with this aspect of policy D1 of the LDP.

5.4 Access, Parking and Highway Safety

5.4.1 Policy T2 of the LDP aims to create and maintain an accessible environment, requiring development to have sufficient parking facilities with regard to the Council's adopted parking standards. Similarly, policy D1 of the LDP seeks to include safe and secure vehicle and cycle parking having regard to the Council's adopted parking standards and maximise connectivity within the development and to the surrounding areas including the provision of high quality and safe pedestrian and cycle routes.

5.4.2 The proposed developments are not reducing the amount of parking available at the site. There will be one added bedroom however there will be two parking spaces to the rear of the dwelling and therefore there is no objection in relation to parking provision.

5.4.3 Furthermore, the Highway Authority has not objected to the fence on the grounds of highway safety.

5.4.4 Therefore, there is no objection to the proposal in terms of car parking as it complies with this aspect of policy D1 of the LDP.

5.5 Amenity Space

5.5.1 The Essex Design Guide advises a suitable garden size for dwellings with three or more bedrooms is 100 square metres.

5.5.2 The current private garden measures 240 square metres. The proposed developments will result in the private garden measuring 205 square metres.

5.5.3 The resulting garden will measure above the standard and therefore the proposal is in accordance with this aspect of policy D1 of the LDP.

6. ANY RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- **HOUSE/MAL/18/00223** – Proposed two storey side extension and front porch extension. Erection of 2.2 metre high boundary close boarded fence and concrete gravel boards and posts. Replace detached garage at rear. – Refused

7. CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

7.1 Representations received from Parish / Town Councils

Name of Parish / Town Council	Comment	Officer Response
Maldon Town Council	Recommend refusal as the fence, by means of its height, bulk and scale, is out of keeping with the streetscene.	Comments noted. See section 5.2.6

7.2 Representations received from External Consultees

Name of Statutory Consultee / Other Organisation	Comment	Officer Response
County Highways	No objection.	Comments noted.

7.3 Representations received from Interested Parties

7.3.1 No letters of objection have been received at the time of writing this report.

7.3.2 No letters of support have been received at the time of writing this report.

8. REASON FOR REFUSAL

1. The two storey side extension, by reason of its scale and bulk, is considered to be a visually dominant addition which is considered to detrimentally harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and policies D1 and H4 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan.