



**REPORT of
DIRECTOR OF SERVICE DELIVERY**

to
**SOUTH EASTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
6 APRIL 2022**

Application Number	22/00224/HOUSE
Location	Pond House, Scotts Hill, Southminster, CM0 7BE
Proposal	Demolition of existing side extension, construction of new single storey side extension, part single and part two storey rear extension, construction of raised terrace and alterations to fenestration.
Applicant	Mr S Bell
Agent	Miss Andrea Savill – Athena Architectural Services
Target Decision Date	03 April 2022
Case Officer	Hannah Dungate
Parish	SOUTHMINSTER
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In Councillor A S Fluker has called in the application for the following policy reasons: Policy D1 Councillor M G Bassenger has called in the application for the following policy reasons: Scale and Bulk – Policies S1 / H4

1. RECOMMENDATION


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

2. SITE MAP

Please see overleaf.

Pond House Scotts Hill Southminster CM0 7BE
22/00224/HOUSE



 <p>Copyright 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 100018588 2014</p>	Scale:	1:5,000
	Organisation:	Maldon District Council
	Department:	Department
	Comments:	Not Set
	Date:	23/03/2022
www.maldon.gov.uk	MSA Number:	100018588

3. SUMMARY

3.1 Proposal / brief overview, including any relevant background information

- 3.1.1 The application site is located to the north of Scotts Hill outside the defined settlement boundary of Southminster. The site is occupied by a two-storey detached dwelling of pitched roof design, which is set back from the main road by a substantial distance and is accessed via a track north of Scotts Hill. A group of residential properties fronting Scotts Hill are located to the east of the application site. To the north, east and west of the site are large expanses of open agricultural fields. Residential development along this part of Scotts Hill is sporadic and loose knit in character, with open agricultural fields along each side of the road.
- 3.1.2 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey side to rear extension and two-storey rear extension. The existing single storey side and rear extensions at the property would be demolished to facilitate the proposed development. Whilst the two-storey rear part of the extension would extend from the main house, the single storey side to rear extensions would wrap around the east and north elevations of the property and the extensions would link into each other and be read as a single wrap-around extension.
- 3.1.3 The application follows a previously refused application for a similar development (20/01165/HOUSE refers). Since the previous application, which proposed a two-storey rear extension measuring 8m in depth, the two-storey rear part has been reduced in depth by 2m, so that it would now measure 6m in depth overall. The roof design of this part of the extension has also been amended so that it would now have a double pitched roof design with a central flat roof valley, instead of a tabletop/crown roof design. As a result of the amended roof design, the height of the two-storey extension has been increased so that it would now measure 6.9m in height at the ridge, instead of 6m.
- 3.1.4 The two-storey extension has also been set in from the side elevation of the main house by 1m so that the overall width of the two storey and single storey rear extension would now measure 18.3m instead of 19.3m. The width of the two-storey part would measure 10.4m and the width of the single storey rear part would measure 8.9m. The width of the single storey side extension would measure 7m when measured from the existing side wall of the main property. The overall depth of the single storey side and rear extensions would be 13m when measured from the front of the side extension; this has been reduced from 15m as part of the previous scheme.
- 3.1.5 The proposed single storey side and rear extensions would have the same height as the previous scheme, measuring 4.6m high overall at ridge height. The pitched roof part would extend from the eastern side wall of the existing dwelling; behind this element would be the flat roof element, which would measure 3m in height. Within the flat roof rear extension there would be a pyramid roof lights.
- 3.1.6 The extensions would create an enlarged cinema, pool table, kitchen, boot room and dining area at ground floor and would create two bedrooms and en-suites at first floor level so that the resultant house would contain five bedrooms overall. Also proposed is a wrap-around raised terrace area at ground floor level, which is proposed at the front, rear and both sides of the property.

3.2 Conclusion

- 3.2.1 It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its countryside location, incongruous bulk, scale and poor design would significantly harm the appearance or character of the building itself and would not preserve the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. However, due to its relationship with the neighbouring properties, the proposal would not result in any undue harm by way of overlooking or loss of amenity. It is therefore considered that the proposed development is not in accordance with the relevant policies contained within the Local Development Plan (LDP) and the proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

4. MAIN RELEVANT POLICIES

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

4.1 National Planning Policy Framework 2021 including paragraphs:

- 7 Sustainable development
- 8 Three objectives of sustainable development
- 10-12 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- 38 Decision-making
- 47-50 Determining applications
- 54 – 57 Planning conditions and obligations
- 119 – 123 Making effective use of land
- 126 – 136 Achieving well-designed places

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

- S1 Sustainable Development
- S8 Settlement Boundaries and the Countryside
- D1 Design Quality and Built Environment
- H4 Effective Use of Land
- T1 Sustainable Transport
- T2 Accessibility

4.3 Relevant Planning Guidance / Documents:

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Maldon District Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- Maldon District Vehicle Parking Standards SPD

5. MAIN CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Principle of Development

- 5.1.1 The principle of extending the existing dwellinghouse and of providing facilities in association with residential accommodation is considered acceptable in line with policies S1 and H4 of the approved LDP.

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 seek to create a high-quality built environment for all types of development.

- 5.2.2 Policies S1 and S8 of the approved Maldon District LDP seek to support sustainable developments within the defined settlement boundaries. This is to ensure that the countryside will be protected for its landscape, natural resources and ecological value as well as its intrinsic character and beauty.
- 5.2.3 It should be noted that good design is fundamental to high quality new development and its importance is reflected in the NPPF. Similar support for high quality design and the appropriate layout, scale and detailing of development is required by Policy D1 and H4 of the LDP and is found within the Maldon District Design Guide (2017).
- 5.2.4 A successful development needs to integrate well with the existing streetscene. Visual cues such as rhythm, proportions and alignments taken from adjacent buildings should be used to inform the design of the development.
- 5.2.5 Although the existing property is set back from the main road of Scotts Hill, it is located within the rural area and is surrounded by open countryside to the north, east and west. The existing property is relatively modest in size and currently measures 9m deep and 12m wide. The main body of the property has an approximate floor area of 108sqm and is comprised of various pitched roof elements of varying scale. Due to the convoluted roof design of the existing property, along with its varying parts, the existing house is not considered to be of a particularly high standard of design.
- 5.2.6 The proposed extensions would measure 6m in depth from the rear wall of the existing property and would be over 18m wide overall; this is very large for a householder extension, particularly in relation to the existing property, which is modest in size, having a width of only 12m. In terms of floor area, the extensions would almost double the floor area of the existing property and would increase its depth by two thirds. The width of the house would also increase by over half. For an extension to be considered as a subservient, subordinate extension to the main property, it should not normally increase the size of the existing property by more than a third. In this instance, the extensive size of the extensions would exceed this to such an extent that they would not appear as subordinate extensions. The two-storey extension in particular would significantly increase the overall scale and bulk of the property, which would result in an overly dominant structure that would have a discordant appearance with the character of the existing dwellinghouse and be visually intrusive within the countryside. Although it is noted that the extensions have been slightly reduced in size compared to the previous scheme, this modest reduction in size has not addressed the previous concerns outlined with the application.
- 5.2.7 Whilst it is noted that the application site is relatively large, and outline planning permission has previously been granted for a large replacement property at the site, any extensions to an existing property should be proportionate and visually subservient features to the main body of the property. The indicative layout of the proposed property that was granted outline planning permission as per the previous application appears to have a relatively shallow span depth and would be articulated in form and design (15/01124/OUT refers). Although it is acknowledged that the tabletop/crown roof design of the two-storey rear extension has been amended, so that the pitched roof design would now better relate to the existing property, the large width and depth of the extensions would mean that there would be an unsympathetic flat roof valley element between the pitched roofs. This design would result in the development being of poor design quality and at odds with the pitched roofs of the

existing dwelling. The significant bulk and poor design of the resultant dwelling would not therefore detract from the character of the existing dwelling or the surrounding area as a result of its incongruous and intrusive appearance.

- 5.2.8 It is noted that the external materials proposed would be the same as the existing dwelling and there are no objections to the raised terrace proposed. However, it is considered that the extensions, by reason of their scale, bulk and poor design quality, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding countryside contrary to policies S8, 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 application site is bordered by residential properties to the east and west. Given the substantial separation distance, which would remain between the site boundaries and the enlarged property, the proposed development is not considered to represent an unneighbourly form of development and would not give rise to overlooking or overshadowing, in accordance with the stipulations of Policy D1 of the LDP in this regard.

5.4 Access, Parking and Highway Safety

- 5.4.1 Policy D1 of the approved LDP seeks to include safe and secure vehicle and cycle parking having regard to the Council's adopted parking standards.
- 5.4.2 Whilst the proposal would result in an additional bedroom at the property, there is sufficient car parking provision at the front of the property to accommodate three cars which would be in accordance with the recommended standards for a five-bedroom property. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would not therefore have a harmful impact on parking at the property.

5.5 Private Amenity Space and Landscaping

- 5.5.1 Policy D1 of the approved LDP requires all development to provide sufficient and usable private and public amenity spaces, green infrastructure and public open spaces. In addition, the adopted SPD advises a suitable garden size for each type of dwellinghouse, namely 100m² of private amenity space for dwellings with three or more bedrooms.
- 5.5.2 Private amenity space in excess of 100sqm would remain at the property, should the proposed works be implemented. Therefore, the proposal is in compliance with Policy D1 of the LDP.

6. ANY RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

- **14/00011/OUT** – Outline application for 3 No. four bedroom new dwellings with garage and private access. Refused – 5 March 2014
- **15/00124/OUT** – Proposed redevelopment of Pond House to provide a replacement dwelling of 604sq m, a stable block of 107sq m, a 3-bay cart

lodge of 70sq m and garden machinery store and gymnasium of 132sq m.
Approved – 17 June 2015

- **20/01165/HOUSE** - Construction of single storey side and rear extension, two storey rear extension, raised terrace and alterations to existing openings.
Refused – 19 January 2021

7. CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

7.1 Representations received from Parish / Town Councils

Name of Parish / Town Council	Comment	Officer Response
Southminster Parish Council	Recommend the grant of planning permission.	Noted

7.2 Representations received from Interested Parties (*summarised*)

7.2.1 No neighbour representations for the application have been received.

8. PROPOSED REASON FOR REFUSAL

- 1 The proposed two storey and single storey extensions, as a result of their excessive scale, bulk and poor design quality, would appear as dominant and intrusive features which would be out of keeping with and so harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the site's surroundings, to the detriment of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies S8, D1 and H4 of the approved LDP and the NPPF.