## **DELEGATED DECISION OFFICER REPORT**

AUTHORISATION	INITIALS	DATE
File completed and officer recommendation:	LN	19/09/2018
Planning Development Manager authorisation:	SCE	19.09.18
Admin checks / despatch completed	711	201418

Application:

18/01249/FUL

Town / Parish: Little Oakley Parish Council

Applicant:

Mrs Kim Lane

Address:

101 Harwich Road Little Oakley Harwich

Development:

Proposed demolition of existing store building & construction of side extension.

### 1. Town / Parish Council

Little Oakley Parish

Little Oakley Parish Council have looked at the application for

Council

the above property and have given a decision of Neutral.

# 2. Consultation Responses

N/A

### 3. Planning History

18/01249/FUL

Proposed demolition of existing store building &

Current

construction of side extension.

### 4. Relevant Policies / Government Guidance

NPPF National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 National Planning Practice Guidance

Tendring District Local Plan 2007

QL9 Design of New Development

QL10 Designing New Development to Meet Functional Needs

QL11 Environmental Impacts and Compatibility of Uses

HG9 Private Amenity Space

**HG14** Side Isolation

Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Publication Draft (June 2017) SPL3 Sustainable Design

### Status of the Local Plan

The 'development plan' for Tendring is the 2007 'adopted' Local Plan. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF (2018) allows local planning authorities to give due weight to adopted albeit outdated policies according to their degree of consistency with the policies in the NPPF. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF also allows weight to be given to policies in emerging plans according to their stage of preparation, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies and the degree of consistency with national policy. As of 16th June 2017, the emerging Local Plan for Tendring is the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Publication Draft.

Section 1 of the Local Plan (which sets out the strategy for growth across North Essex including Tendring, Colchester and Braintree) was examined in January and May 2018 and the Inspector's initial findings were published in June 2018. They raise concerns, very specifically, about the three 'Garden Communities' proposed in north Essex along the A120 designed to deliver longer-term sustainable growth in the latter half of the plan period and beyond 2033. Further work is required to

address the Inspector's concerns and the North Essex Authorities are considering how best to proceed.

With more work required to demonstrate the soundness of the Local Plan, its policies cannot yet carry the full weight of adopted policy, however they can carry some weight in the determination of planning applications. The examination of Section 2 of the Local Plan will progress once matters in relation to Section 1 have been resolved. Where emerging policies are particularly relevant to a planning application and can be given some weight in line with the principles set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF, they will be considered and, where appropriate, referred to in decision notices. In general terms however, more weight will be given to policies in the NPPF and the adopted Local Plan.

# 5. Officer Appraisal (including Site Description and Proposal)

# **Site Description**

The application site is located to the west of Harwich Road, inside the development boundary of Little Oakley. Adjacent to the site, to the east, is the coastal protection belt and SSSI. The site serves a detached two storey dwelling with single storey side projection to the north. It is currently constructed of black boarding and a tile roof, but is vacant and undergoing extensive renovation works. The property is situated directly adjacent to the pavement with no front garden area. The rear of the site is currently accessed via the adjacent properties driveway. The garden area is currently laid to lawn with planting and fencing on the side and rear boundaries. No parking provision is shown within the application site. The property to the south, known as Stowford House, is under the same ownership.

### **Proposal**

The application proposes the demolition of the existing single storey store building to the north of the site and the construction of a side extension. It will measure 9.5m wide by 5.78m deep with an eaves height of 2.5m and a ridge height of 4.5m. It will be constructed of Oak timber cladding to match the cladding being installed on the existing dwelling and pan tiles will be set aside from the demolished store and re-used. Two roof lights are proposed on the roof slope of the front elevation.

### **Assessment**

The main considerations of this application are the design, impact on residential amenity and parking at the site.

The adopted Tendring District Local Plan (2007) Policies QL9, QL10 and QL11 seek to ensure that all new development makes a positive contribution to the quality of the local environment and protects or enhances local character, and the development will not have a materially damaging impact on the privacy, daylight and other amenities of occupiers of nearby property. Policy SPL3 of the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond Publication Draft (June 2017) carries forward the sentiments of these saved policies.

Policy HG14 of the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) states that extensions over 4m in height will be required to retain appropriate open space between the dwelling and side boundaries to ensure that new development is appropriate in its setting and does not create a cramped appearance; and, to safeguard the amenities and aspect of adjoining residents.

#### Design

The proposed extension will replace the existing store. It will sit at the same position on the front boundary, be the same height overall, and extend 1.7m further into the rear garden. Furthermore, the existing store is built abutting the side boundary of the site, but the proposed extension is set 0.3m away from the side boundary. Due to the similarities between existing and proposed development the extension, in terms of scale, will not appear vastly different from the existing store

to be demolished and is considered to be appropriate to the site and the surrounding area and would not appear cramped within the plot.

Whilst the roof tiles will be reused and use of cladding is similar in nature, the extension will appear visually different as a result of the use of Oak timber cladding rather than black cladding. However, the Oak timber is considered acceptable as it will match that being installed on the remainder of the dwelling. The development overall is not considered to have an adverse impact upon the street scene and is considered acceptable in design terms.

## Impact on Residential Amenity

The position of the extension within the site results in the neighbour to the north, No. 103 Harwich Road, being the only neighbour being affected by the development. Due to the dwellings position directly adjacent to the pavement the proposed extension will be located over 12m from the front elevation of this neighbouring property, which is well set back from the road. Plus, as a result of the development the building is now located 0.3m from the boundary with this neighbour rather than being built on the boundary, whereby improving the relationship; and the development will be obscured from view by mature planting within the neighbour's boundary. For these reasons and as the development is so similar to the existing built form, the proposed development is not considered to cause any adverse impact on the daylight, privacy or other amenities currently enjoyed by this neighbour.

Sufficient private amenity space is retained for the occupiers of the property, in accordance with Policy HG9.

### **Parking**

The proposed extension will result in the creation of an additional bedroom within the dwelling. No parking provision is illustrated within the application drawing and whilst plenty of parking was available within the site to the south (under the same ownership); at the time of the officer site visit none was apparent within the application boundaries. Notwithstanding this, it is noted that bedrooms will already exist within the first floor of the dwelling and the development would therefore not create any additional need for parking to be provided from that which currently exists. For this reason there is no objection to the development in terms of parking available at the site.

#### Other Considerations

Little Oakley Parish Council have neutral views of the application.

No letters of representation have been received.

### Conclusion

It is considered that the proposed development is consistent with the National and Local Plan Policies identified above, and in the absence of any material harm resulting from the development, the application is recommended for approval.

# 6. Recommendation

Approval - Full

### 7. Conditions

The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. 2018-11 entitled Existing and Proposed Floor Plans; and Drawing No. 2018-11 entitled Existing and Proposed Elevations, Block & Location Plan.

Reason - For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

# 8. Informatives

# Positive and Proactive Statement

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received and subsequently determining to grant planning permission in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Are there any letters to be sent to applicant / agent with the decision? If so please specify:	NO
Are there any third parties to be informed of the decision? If so, please specify:	NO