

SITE PLAN ATTACHED

**08. HONEYSUCKLE LODGE BLACKMORE ROAD KELVEDON HATCH ESSEX
CM15 0BJ**

**SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND CONSTRUCTION OF
DETACHED OUTBUILDING (RETROSPECTIVE).**

APPLICATION NO: 15/00354/FUL

WARD	Brizes & Doddinghurst	8/13 WEEK DATE	06.05.2015
PARISH	Kelvedon Hatch	POLICIES	NPPF NPPG CP1
CASE OFFICER	Mr Jonathan Binks	01277 312769	
Drawing no(s) relevant to this decision:	1; 2; 3; 4;		

This application was referred by Cllr Parker from Weekly Report No 1689 for consideration by the Committee. The reason(s) are as follows:

I would like to refer the above as the height of the outbuilding according to the applicant when measured from a particular spot complies with permitted development for outbuilding constructed in the curtilage of the property.

Update since publication of Weekly List 1689

None

1. Proposals

The application is seeking permission for a single storey side and rear extension, and a detached outbuilding to the property at Honeysuckle Lodge, Blackmore Road. The works have commenced and have been substantially (but not wholly) completed.

The proposed extension would have a depth of 7.11 metres beyond the original rear of the dwelling and a maximum of 3.2 metres beyond the side elevation. The maximum height of the extension would be 2.757 metres. The side enlargement would provide for a new garage at the property.

The proposed outbuilding would have a length of 11.3 metres, a width of 4.63 metres and a maximum height of 2.8 metres.

2. Policy Context

National Policies

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is now a material consideration in planning decisions. The weight to be given to it will be a matter for the decision makers planning judgement in each particular case. The Framework replaces all the national planning guidance documents as stated in the NPPF, including Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Planning Policy Statements. Notwithstanding this, the NPPF granted a one year period of grace for existing adopted Local Plan policies which has now ended, but, the NPPF advises that following this 12 month period, due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the Framework, (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given).

On the 6th March 2014, the government published Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) which, along with the NPPF, is a material consideration in the determination of planning application. The NPPGs have been taken into account, where relevant in the following assessment.

Brentwood Replacement Local Plan 2005:

CP1 - General Development Criteria

3. Relevant History

- 14/00767/FUL: Single storey side and rear extension, dormer windows to rear and repositioning of door to front elevation. -Application Refused

4. Neighbour Responses

9 neighbour representation letters were sent to the surrounding properties. One response was received from a property not on the notification list. The objections raised included:

- The size and dominance of the outbuilding
- The trees were felled along the public footpath prior to the application
- Harm to the attractiveness of the footpath behind the application site
- The outbuilding is a dominant feature for adjacent residents
- The outbuilding and extension has resulted in too much available land being built on, increasing the footprint
- The height of the outbuilding exceeds the permitted development requirements

Kelvedon Hatch Parish Council raise no objections to the proposal.

5. Consultation Responses

- **Parish Council:**
No objections.

6. Summary of Issues

The application is in response to 14/00767/FUL which was refused with regards to a rear dormer window, the proposed side and rear extension is not materially different to the one considered acceptable by the previous application.

Effect on character and appearance:

The application property is one half of a pair of semi detached properties within a suburban residential area of Blackmore. The rear garden of the application property backs on to a single track lane and the rear gardens of a number of properties back on to this public space.

Design

The side and rear extensions would be significant in size but of a fairly low visual impact and subject to a condition to agree external render, would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

The outbuilding however, is also of a significant size and height, very close to the boundary with the public footpath. It has been designed with a chamfered edge (n.b the siting of the building on proposed block plan does not correctly plot the building in relation to this rear boundary). Due to the higher ground level within the site, it is a highly prominent feature when viewed along the public semi-rural footpath. It appears as an overdominant and contrived built form.

It would therefore be harmful to the visual amenity of the area and detrimental to the appearance of the area. Because of its height and proximity to the boundary it is not considered that a landscaping condition to provide adequate screening would overcome this harm.

Effect on Neighbour Living Conditions

The proposed side and rear enlargement would extend up to the boundary with both neighbouring properties at Meadowview and Ramblers Cottage, Blackmore Road. The dwelling at Ramblers Cottage is of a similar depth and distance from the boundary as the dwelling at the application site. The boundary between the dwellings is separated by a brick wall and a hedge both approximately 3 metres in height. The boundary treatments between the two dwellings are considered to be sufficient to screen the majority of the extension from the habitable dwelling at Ramblers Cottage.

The dwelling at Meadowview has a rear enlargement which extends along the boundary with the application site and beyond the rear of the proposal. The proposed extensions is higher than that of the boundary treatments and the rear enlargement at Meadowview. It is considered the enlargement at Meadowview screens the proposal sufficiently and the extension would not result in a significant detrimental impacts on the living conditions of the occupiers.

The proposed outbuilding is of a sufficient distance from neighbouring dwellings as to not cause a significant detrimental impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Conclusions

The design and location of the rear extensions are considered to be acceptable however the outbuilding is of a size and siting that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and therefore conflict with local plan policy CP1 (i) and (iii) and the aims and objectives of the national planning policy.

7. Recommendation

The Application be REFUSED for the following reasons:-

R1 U10088

The size and height of the outbuilding together with its proximity to the boundary with the adjacent single track would be a dominant and prominent feature that would be harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area, and detrimental to the character and appearance of that part of the area. This would be in conflict with the local plan policy CP1 (i) and (iii) and the national planning policy framework which expects new development to be of good design and support local distinctiveness.

Informative(s)

1 INF20

The drawing numbers listed above are relevant to this decision

2 INF24

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and discussing those with the Applicant. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to resolve those matters within the timescale allocated for the determination of this planning application. However, the Local Planning Authority has clearly set out, within its report, the steps necessary to remedy the harm identified within the reasons for refusal – which may lead to the submission of a more acceptable proposal in the future. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

DECIDED: