



**REPORT of
INTERIM HEAD OF PLANNING SERVICES**

to
**CENTRAL AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE
19 APRIL 2017**

Application Number	HOUSE/MAL/17/00164
Location	75 Goldhanger Road, Heybridge
Proposal	Front two storey extension, rear single/two storey extension & new external render finish on insulation
Applicant	Mr & Mrs Bowyer
Agent	Mark Perkins - Mark Perkins Partnership
Target Decision Date	20 April 2017
Case Officer	Hannah Bowles, TEL: 01621 875733
Parish	HEYBRIDGE
Reason for Referral to the Committee / Council	Member Call In

1. RECOMMENDATION


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

2. SITE MAP

Please see overleaf.

75 Goldhanger Road, Heybridge
HOUSE/MAL/17/00164



 <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> <p>www.maldon.gov.uk</p>	Scale:	1:2,500
	Organisation:	Maldon District Council
	Department:	Department
	Comments:	Central Committee 17/00164
	Date:	05/04/2017
	MSA Number:	100018588

3. SUMMARY

3.1 Proposal / brief overview, including any relevant background information

- 3.1.1 The application site is set in a residential setting within the settlement boundary of Heybridge. A semi-detached two storey dwelling currently occupies the site. The main form of development to the northwest and northeast of the site is semi-detached, two storey dwellings similar in size and design. The properties opposite the site are an eclectic mix with no prevailing pattern.
- 3.1.2 The application seeks planning permission for a two storey front extension and a part single and part two storey rear extension.
- 3.1.3 The front extension would measure 3.1m in depth, 4.5m in width, 3.9m to the eaves and 6.6m to the ridge, finished with a gable roof. The extension would accommodate a hall area and study at ground floor level and an additional bedroom at first floor level.
- 3.1.4 The two storey element of the rear extension would measure 3.7m in depth, 4.4m in width, 5.1m to the eaves and 7.8m to the ridge. The extension would accommodate a lift and shower room at ground floor level and an enlarged bedroom at first floor level.
- 3.1.5 The single storey rear element would measure 3.2m in depth, 2.9m in width and 3m to the top of the flat roof. The extension would accommodate a dining room.
- 3.1.6 It should be noted that planning permission has been approved under reference 16/01363/HOUSE) for a single storey front extension and part single and part two storey rear extension. The proposed front extension has been revised to include a first floor and enlarged from the previously approved front extension by 1.7m in depth, 0.8m in width and 4.1m in height. The proposed rear extension is identical in nature.

3.2 Conclusion

- 3.2.1 Whilst there are no objections to the proposed rear extension, the proposed two storey front extension, due to its design and style, including its scale, bulk and siting is not considered to appear subservient to the main dwelling and would result in an incongruous and dominant addition to the dwelling that is unsympathetic to the general character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to saved policies BE1 and BE6 of the Replacement Local Plan, emerging policy D1 of the Submission Local Development Plan and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

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:

- 7
- 17
- 47
- 56
- 118

4.2 Maldon District Replacement Local Plan 2005 – Saved Policies:

- BE1 - Design of Development and Landscaping
- BE6 - Extensions to Dwellings
- T8 - Vehicle Parking Standards

4.3 Maldon District Local Development Plan submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination-in-Public on 25 April 2014:

- D1 - Design Quality and Built Environment
- T1 - Sustainable transport

4.4 Relevant Planning Guidance / Documents:

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

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 BE6 of the RLP and H4 of the emerging 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 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 basis of emerging policy D1 of the Local Plan ensures that all development will not have a detrimental impact on its

surrounding area and local context and will actively seek opportunities for enhancement in the built environment.

5.2.3 In determining an appropriate contextual relationship with surrounding development, factors such as height, scale, massing and siting are material considerations. Details such as architectural style, along with colour texture of materials, are also fundamental in ensuring the appearance of any new development is sympathetic to its surrounding and therefore wholly appropriate in its context.

5.2.4 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”.

“that 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”.

5.2.5 In terms of design, it is noted the proposed front extension would have a ridge height around 1.4m lower than that of the existing dwelling and the materials would match those used on the existing dwelling. However, it is considered that it would look out of place given its context. It would project forward of the principle elevation of the property by around 1.8m appearing bulky and dominant and the proposed gable roof would appear out of place and disjointed in relation to the existing gable roof on the front elevation, which is located centrally between the pair of semi-detached properties. It is considered that the front extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the existing dwelling.

5.2.6 Furthermore, whilst the dwelling on site is set back from the public highway by around 13.3m due to the open frontage of the site, the front extension would be highly visible from within the public realm. There is a prevailing pattern of development along the south side of Goldhanger Road and it has to be noted that the property is part of a pair of very similar semi-detached houses which are almost symmetrical to each other. The proposed extension would result in the loss of the sense of symmetry and, whilst it is acknowledged that some dwellings have been extended to the front by the form of a porch, or single storey addition, the extensions in the immediate locality are not of comparable scale, bulk or height to that proposed as part of this application. It is considered that it would result in an incongruous addition that would appear dominant when viewed from within the public realm.

5.2.7 The impact of the proposed two storey front extension would, in terms of its siting, scale and design, fail to form a subservient addition to the existing dwelling or streetscene. The proposal would result in a development that would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the locality, and the rhythm of the streetscene.

5.2.8 As stated above the proposed rear extension has been approved under application 16/01363/HOUSE. It comprises a two storey element finished with a gable roof and a single storey element finished with a flat roof. In terms of proportions, namely the size, bulk and height, the rear extension is not considered to appear as a dominant

feature, with a ridge height noticeably lower than that of the existing dwelling. The proposed materials would match those used on the dwelling ensuring that it harmonises with the general character and appearance of the existing dwelling; overall the design of the proposed development is not considered to look out of place in relation to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, it is located to the rear of the property where limited views of the development would be available from within the public realm.

5.3 Impact on Residential Amenity

- 5.3.1 Policies BE1 and BE6 of the RLP protect neighbouring occupiers from unacceptable development which results in a loss of amenity in relation to overlooking, overpowering or undue reduction of light to the main windows of their property. Similarly, the basis of policy D1 of the submission LDP seeks to ensure that development will protect the amenity of its surrounding area.
- 5.3.2 The application site has two adjacent neighbouring properties; no. 73 which adjoins the dwelling at no. 75, is located to the north west of the application site and no. 77 is located to the northeast of the application site.
- 5.3.3 Given the distance of the proposed front extension of around 2.4m from the boundary with no. 73 and around 2.2m from the boundary with no. 77, it is not considered the development would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours by way of overpowering or loss of light. Furthermore, no concerns are raised with regards to overlooking, whilst there is a window proposed on the side elevation of the front extension, it is at ground floor level and would have an outlook of the driveway.
- 5.3.4 The single storey element of the rear extension is just set in from the boundary with neighbouring property no. 73. Given the siting of the proposed development it just fails the 45° daylight assessment rule in plan view, but does not in elevation view. Therefore, the extension will not result in a loss of outlook or daylight received by the closest ground floor window on the rear elevation of the adjoining property, to such a degree as to result in a demonstrable impact on the amenity of the adjacent dwelling. Furthermore, the two storey element is located around 2.9m from the dwelling at no. 73 and around 3.4m from the dwelling at no. 77, due to the distance and siting of the extension, it is not considered to give rise to issues regarding loss of outlook or light.
- 5.3.5 There are no windows proposed in the side elevations on the proposed rear extension at first floor level. The windows located within the rear elevation have the same outlook, of the rear garden, as the existing windows. Therefore, no concerns are raised with regards to overlooking. Furthermore, due to the scale and siting, the proposed rear extension is not considered to form a dominant or overbearing addition to the adjoining neighbours.
- 5.3.6 Therefore, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in significant demonstrable harm to the neighbouring occupiers.

5.4 Access, Parking and Highway Safety

- 5.4.1 Policy T8 seeks to provide appropriate off-street parking provision in accordance with the District's adopted vehicle parking standards (Adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) July 2006).
- 5.4.2 The adopted parking standard requirement for the resulting four bedroom dwelling is three off-street parking spaces. It is noted that the Parking Standards are expressed as maximum standards and Government guidance encourages the reduction in the reliance on the car and promoted methods of sustainable transport.
- 5.4.3 The property benefits from an area of hard standing to the front of dwelling, although this area would be reduced as a result of the proposed development, the remaining space could comfortably accommodate in excess of three cars. Therefore, there are no concerns raised in relation to parking provision.

5.5 Private Amenity Space and Landscaping

- 5.5.1 Policy BE1 of the RLP requires that amenity space is provided that is appropriate to the type of development. In addition, the Essex Design Guide advises a suitable garden size for dwellings with three or more bedrooms is 100sq m.
- 5.5.2 The site benefits from a rear amenity space in excess of the recommended standard, although the proposed development would result in a loss of some of the rear garden, the rear amenity space will continue to be provided, within the domestic curtilage of the dwelling in excess of the recommended standard. Therefore, there is no objection to the proposal in relation to amenity space.

6. ANY RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

02/00471/FUL - Two storey rear extension - Refused - 25.06.2002
04/00693/FUL - Two storey and one storey rear extensions. - Approved - 09.08.2004
07/00563/FUL - Installation of dropped kerb – Approved - 18.07.2007
16/01363/HOUSE - Front single storey extension, rear single/two storey extension & new external render finish on insulation – Approved – 13.02.2017.

7. CONSULTATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

7.1 Representations received from Parish / Town Councils

Name of Parish / Town Council	Comment	Officer Response
Heybridge	No comment	Noted

8. REASON FOR REFUSAL

- 1 The proposed two storey front extension, due to its design and style, including its scale, bulk and siting, would result in an incongruous and dominant form of development that is unsympathetic to the general character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to saved policies BE1 and BE6 of the Replacement Local Plan, emerging policy D1 of the Submission Local Development Plan and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.