

**CIRCULATED AT
THE MEETING**



**REPORT of
DIRECTOR OF STRATEGY, PERFORMANCE AND GOVERNANCE**

to
SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
Wednesday 20 May 2020

MEMBERS' UPDATE

AGENDA ITEM NO. 1

Application Number	20/00364/HOUSE
Location	8 The Cobbins, Burnham-On-Crouch, Essex CM0 8QL
Proposal	Proposed part single, part 2 storey side/rear extensions. Including roof alterations to proposed attached garage with planning approval ref HOUSE/MAL/19/01092.
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Lambert
Agent	Mr Ashley Robinson - Ashley Robinson Property Designs
Target Decision Date	28.05.2020
Case Officer	Annie Keen
Parish	Burnham North
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In – Cllr Stamp Policy H4 and S6

Members attention is drawn to the objection section in the report in which an error is noted. The number of objections at the time of writing was 9 objectors, these objections have been taken into consideration within the report. Furthermore, since the finalisation of the report, an additional 8 objections have been received and are addressed below.

8 CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

8.1 Representations received from Interested Parties (*summarised*)

8.1.1 Eight letters were received **objecting** to the application and are summarised as set out in the table below:

Objection Comment	Officer Response
It is too large and against the ethos of The Cobbins. It would have a separate entrance door which could be deemed to adding a new dwelling and would set a precedent. Permission has been granted to convert the existing garage and increase the area above it. The new garage appears to be larger and higher, opening the path for an application for a 'storage area' which was refused under application 19/00116/HOUSE.	Comments noted

Objection Comment	Officer Response
<p>The extension is hugely out of proportion and sets an unacceptable precedent, doubling the size of the property causing a disproportionate amount of built form. There would be loss of light and surrounding properties would be closed in with No.6 feeling overshadowed and No.2 looking at the building. The proposal turns a detached house into a semi-detached dwelling as there is a risk the extension could be used as a separate property.</p>	<p>Please see section 5.3 of the report.</p>
<p>The original design of the dwellings was reminiscent of Essex rural dwellings with black boarding or cement render, the application is not sympathetic to this concept and is ill-conceived. The extension would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.</p>	<p>Comments noted, please see section 5.3 of the report.</p>
<p>Permission has been granted to convert the garage and build over the top, this together with the proposed extension would make the house enormous and give precedent for future development.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Not in proportion with other buildings on the estate and would damage the quality of life of neighbouring occupiers.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Lack of parking within the cul-de-sac and restricted access and manoeuvring area.</p>	<p>Please see section 5.4.</p>
<p>It would appear oppressively dominating within the cul-de-sac and excessive.</p>	<p>Please see section 5.2.</p>
<p>The estate has a degree of spaciousness with dwellings on proportionate plots giving the area a low density, suburban character, the extension would have the overall effect of a huge building on a small plot with limited amenity.</p>	<p>Comments noted, please see sections 5.2 and 5.5</p>
<p>The annex should be subservient to the host dwelling, the development is for a southern extension, the northern extension has already been granted under 19/01092/HOUSE. These applications were to accommodate elderly relatives, one of which has now passed. There are currently two residents living in a five-bedroomed house.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
<p>A similar proposal was refused at committee due to scale and bulk. The Council's website states it <i>'is minded to approve well-designed, sensitive planning applications where possible, i.e., where they don't contradict the Neighbourhood Plan, where they don't contravene planning law and building regulations, and where they don't upset immediate neighbours....'</i>. Immediate neighbours have submitted objections, the development would cause overlooking and there is limited car parking.</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
<p>No other house in the area has been granted permission of</p>	

Objection Comment	Officer Response
expansion at both ends.	Comment noted
Would cause loss of light to No.6 The Cobbins and would not be in keeping with the surrounding area and would alter the streetscene.	Comment noted

8.1.2 Two letters were received **commenting** on the application and is summarised as set out in the table below:

Comments	Officer Response
<p>A letter has been received from the applicant in response to objecting comments and the Officers Report:</p> <p>The width of the development was kept to 5 metres to provide a wheel chair lift and a very small self-contained room at ground floor whilst using the master bedroom at first floor. The existing house is 15.5 metres in width and therefore the extension is under half the width of the existing house. Other houses within The Cobbins have had extensions.</p> <p>The development has been taken back from the boundary by 4.3 metres and the profile mirrors that of the house.</p> <p>The majority of the objecting comments are not purely planning reasons.</p>	Comments noted
<p>A further letter was submitted by the applicant in response to the Officers Report:</p> <p>The extension is only 5 metres wide and a continuation of the house building line. It is 23.8% of the house footprint. The side of the house reserved for the Annex is subservient as the house is 3 metres less wide on the South side, rather than the North side where the house has a 3.3 metre wider section. From the existing house to the front door of the annex the proposal is therefore subservient from the streetscene.</p> <p>The windows are all the same size, the new dormer is slightly raised by 170mm due to Government regulations for insulation. The old dormers could be upgraded to the same spec or smaller windows installed, which could be imposed by condition.</p> <p>Application 18/01428/HOUSE was withdrawn following a site visit and advice for a separate garage and smaller annex. Peter Elliot advised once the garage was approved an application could be submitted to infill the land behind it.</p> <p>Application 19/01092/HOUSE was not an annex, it was a new garage and corrections to the house with internal adjustments to accommodate Jenny's mum – Mrs Dowsett. The floor area was</p>	Comment noted

not increasing.

We are not building a new bedroom or upstairs bathroom, it is adapting the existing master bedroom and en-suite to provide wheel chair access.

The other side of the house protrudes by 3.3 metres, the proposal on the south side where the wall of the frontage cuts in by 3.3 metres and therefore the annex is subservient.

The extension to the north will allow for the altered bedroom to be used by the applicant as they are donating their bedroom to their father for his narrow 5 metre annex.

A new bedroom or annex is not being built at first floor and the existing house protrudes 3.3 metres towards the drive, the annex would be infill and therefore subservient.

The annex would be 4.3 metres from the boundary whereas the approved garage would only be 1-1.5 metres from the boundary. The garage partly hides the proposal.

Previous applications have been approved in the area for side extensions (No.17 The Cobbins – 13/00055/HOUSE).

The extension is on the less dominant side of the house and tucked away from the street.