



Council Offices, Kiln Road,
Thundersley, Benfleet,
Essex SS7 1TF.
Tel. No: 01268 882200
Fax No: 01268 882455



David Marchant LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) CEng FICE FCI
Chief Executive

AGENDA

Committee: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Date and Time: Tuesday 3rd July 2018 at 7.30 p.m.

Venue: Council Chamber

N.B. This meeting will be webcast live on the internet.

Membership: Councillors Hart (Chairman), Mumford (Vice Chairman), Acott, Anderson, Blackwell, Cole, Cross, Mrs Haunts, Johnson, Ladzrie, Sharp, Taylor and Mrs Wass.

Substitutes: Councillors Mrs Blissett, Dick, Palmer and Mrs Sach

Canvey Island Town Councillors : Greig and TBC

Officers attending: Rob Davis - Planning Development and Enforcement Manager
Fiona Wilson – Head of Legal Services

Enquiries: Cheryl Salmon, ext. 2454

PART I (Business to be taken in public)

1. Apologies

2. Members' Interests

3. Minutes

A copy of the Minutes of the meeting held on 5th June 2018 is attached.

4. Public Speakers

The Chairman will announce the names of those persons who wish to speak in support /objection under Agenda Item No. 5 (if any).

5. Deposited Plans

The reports are attached.

	Application No	Address	Page No
1.	18/0412/FULCLC	Garages at Windsor Gardens, Thundersley, Benfleet, Essex, SS7 3YF (Victoria Ward) <u>PLEASE NOTE THIS ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA</u>	1
2.	18/0339/FUL	26 Queensmere, Thundersley, Benfleet, Essex, SS7 3XR (Victoria Ward)	7

Agendas and Minutes can be viewed at www.castlepoint.gov.uk
Copies are available in larger print & audio format upon request
If you would like a copy of this agenda in another language or alternative format:
Phone: 0207 520 1431 or email translations@languageline.co.uk

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 5TH JUNE 2018

PRESENT: Councillors Hart (Chairman), Mumford (Vice Chairman), Acott, Blackwell, Cross, Dick*, Johnson, Ladzrie, Mrs Sach*, Sharp, Taylor and Mrs Wass.

***Substitute Members Present:** Councillor Dick for Councillor Mrs Haunts and Councillor Sach for Councillor Anderson.

Also Present: Councillors Riley and Smith also attended.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Anderson, Cole and Mrs Haunts.

1. MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were none.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 1st May 2018 were taken as read and signed as correct.

3. DEPOSITED PLANS

(a) 18/0061/FULCLC – GARAGE SITE CHURCH CLOSE, CANVEY ISLAND, ESSEX, SS8 9HX (CANVEY ISLAND CENTRAL WARD) – DEMOLITION OF 28 GARAGES AND CONSTRUCTION OF 4 NO. HOUSES – CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL

A decision on the application had been deferred at the meeting on 3rd April 2018 as Members required clarification regarding the ownership of the access road serving the proposed development site due to concerns about a lack of future access. Members had also expressed concern about the limited width of the access road serving the new dwellings and felt that this could present problems for emergency vehicles. A lack of street lighting in the road and a lack of detail in the application about surface water drainage had also been raised as issues.

The Planning Officer stated that it had now been confirmed that the borough council owned this road therefore future access to the proposed dwellings would not be an issue.

The Head of Housing and Communities had confirmed that as part of the landscaping scheme, where required, there would be a minimum road width of

6m to allow for cars to safely manoeuvre and park. Where the width of the road was not required to be 6m wide soft landscaping would be provided on the other side of the access road to enhance the attractiveness of the development.

The matter of satisfactory on-site storage for storm water had been addressed. The proposed discharge rate was approximately 1 litre per second which was satisfactory in order to be able to discharge into the public sewer system. Whilst the application did not expressly demonstrate a permission in principle from the relevant water authority under section 106 of the Water Industry Act the owner or occupier of any premises was entitled to have their drains connected to the public sewer for the purposes of discharging foul water and surface water from the premises.

On the matter of street lighting, the Head of Housing and Communities had advised that the existing street lighting in Church Close was part of a wider corporate review. Nonetheless, it was also proposed to provide illuminated bollards along the access road as part of this development.

The Planning Officer explained that the amendments and additional information were considered to have overcome the concerns previously expressed by Members. It was also reported that since the last meeting the Refuse Department had confirmed that it had no objection in terms of refuse and recycling collection. No additional representations had been received since the last meeting. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

The Committee noted that since publication of the Planning Officer's report further information had been received regarding flood risk on the site, if minded to approve the application, Condition 9 in the report would need to be removed and Condition 10 amended accordingly.

Mrs Dunford, a local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

During debate a Member stated that the proposal represented a departure from Residential Design Guidance 2 regarding space around dwellings and did not agree with the Planning Officer's comments that the close proximity of the proposed dwellings to existing properties weighed only slightly against the proposal. The Member also raised concern regarding the flood risk, lack of street lighting and anti-social behaviour in the area.

In response to questions the Planning Officer confirmed that the width of the road was sufficient for emergency and refuse vehicles to access, sprinkler systems would be installed inside the properties, in the event of an emergency access to existing properties would be via Princes Road and Heras fencing would be erected upon demolition of the garages to ensure the security of occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

Members generally felt that the benefits of the development, such as the provision of much needed social housing, outweighed the negative aspects. However there was still concern that the proposed street lighting bollards were not appropriate for this location. It was suggested that high level lighting

columns should be provided and maintained by the borough council and that the road should also be maintained.

Following debate it was:-

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the amended conditions as recommended by the Planning Officer and a condition that as owners of the road Castle Point Borough Council will install, repair and maintain high level lighting columns and maintain the road.

(b) 18/0120/FULCLC – JOHN BURROWS RECREATION GROUND RECTORY ROAD, HADLEIGH, BENFLEET, ESSEX (VICTORIA WARD) – ERECTION OF 9M HIGH BALL STOP NETTING TO PROTECT THE CHILDREN'S PLAY AREA FROM CRICKET BALLS – CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL

(Councillor Blackwell left the Chamber during discussion of this item and did not return to the meeting).

The application sought permission for a mixture of new netting and fencing on the southern side of the children's playground to prevent flying cricket balls from landing in the playground. Whilst this would have some visual impact within the park, it was considered that the benefits of providing the netting outweighed the minor visual intrusion and it was therefore recommended that the planning application be approved.

The application was presented to the Committee because the proposal was on council-owned land.

During discussion Members expressed their full support for the proposal. It was therefore:-

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the Planning Officer's report.

(c) 18/0270/ADV – THE COUNCIL OFFICES, KILN ROAD, BENFLEET, ESSEX, SS7 1TF (CEDAR HALL WARD) – NON-ILLUMINATED DIRECTIONAL SIGNAGE – CASTLE POINT BOROUGH COUNCIL

The application sought advertisement consent for new signage at the front of the council offices indicating the presence of Runnymede Leisure Centre and Hall at the rear of the council offices.

The proposal was acceptable in amenity terms and would not have any detrimental impact on public safety or the highway. It was therefore recommended that advertisement consent be granted.

The application was presented to the Committee because the proposal was on council-owned land.

A Member questioned whether this was the best location as drivers travelling in a westerly direction would have a restricted view of the signage. It was explained that there was not a suitable location on the opposite side of the junction.

During discussion Members indicated their support for the proposal. It was therefore:-

Resolved – That the application be approved subject to the conditions as set out in the Planning Officer's report.

Chairman

ITEM 1

PLEASE NOTE THIS ITEM HAS BEEN WITHDRAWN FROM THE AGENDA

Application Number:	18/0412/FULCLC
Address:	Garages At Windsor Gardens Thundersley Benfleet Essex SS7 3YF (Victoria Ward)
Description of Development:	2 No. new dwellings
Applicant:	Castle Point Borough Council
Case Officer:	Mr Keith Zammit
Expiry Date:	16.07.2018

Summary

The application seeks permission for the replacement of some redundant garages with two new council houses.

The proposal is felt to be acceptable as it meets all relevant policies and residential design guidance and is recommended for APPROVAL.

The application is presented to the committee as the land is council-owned.

Site Visit

It is recommended that members visit the site prior to determination of the application.

Introduction

The application relates to a site at the western end of Windsor Gardens containing 14 derelict garages and is completely hard surfaced. None of the garages are occupied and there is permission to demolish them. The site is bordered by other residential gardens.

The Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a pair of semi-detached two bedroomed houses following the removal of the garages to provide some additional council housing. Each dwelling would be provided with two parking spaces.

The dwellings would be 6.8m deep and have a maximum width of 7.7m with a ridge height of 7.1m. The proposed external materials are to consist of multistock brick for the walls at ground floor level with composite weatherboarding to the majority of the first floor, concrete interlocking tiles for the roof and UPVC window frames. No precise details of these materials have been provided.

Supplementary Documentation

The application is accompanied by a design and access statement which is available to view on the council's website.

Planning History

2nd May 2018 – prior approval granted for demolition of garages (18/0264/DPA)

Relevant Government Guidance and Local Plan Policies

The land is allocated as residential in the Local Plan. The following policies and guidance are therefore of relevance.

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

Paragraphs 56 to 58 (requiring good design)

Local Plan (1998)

EC2 – Design

T8 – Parking standards

Residential Design Guidance

RDG1 – Plot size

RDG2 – Space around dwellings

RDG3 – Building lines

RDG5 – Privacy and living conditions

RDG6 – Amenity space

RDG8 – Detailing

RDG10 – Enclosure and boundary treatment

RDG11 – Landscaping

RDG12 – Parking and access

Consultation

No statutory consultees notified of this application

Public Consultation

No representations received

Evaluation of Proposal

The site is allocated as residential land in the Local Plan therefore there can be no objection in principle to a residential development.

The main issues with this application are the design and layout, impact on neighbours and parking implications.

Design and layout

Policy EC2 of the Local Plan seeks a high standard of design in all new buildings. In particular, the scale, density, siting, design, layout and external materials of any development should be appropriate to its setting and should not harm the character of its surroundings. This is consistent with paragraphs 56 to 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The council has adopted Residential Design Guidance as a supplementary planning document. Within this, guidance at RDG8 states that the provision of detailing elements for all developments must be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling and their design and siting should be an integral part of the dwelling. They must not result in the provision of prominent, dominant, alien or incongruous features which would detract from the appearance of the dwelling or the public realm. The design of all development should result in well-proportioned and balanced properties. Fenestration should be aligned both vertically and horizontally, with consideration given to ensuring that fenestration is balanced and proportionate on sloping sites.

With a ridge height of 7.1m it is not considered that these dwellings would appear excessively tall, prominent or dominant. The precise heights of adjacent houses are not known due to a lack of availability of the original plans of the council housing in the area however a height of 7.1m is considered fairly modest for a two storey property and consequently it is not felt that the proposed properties would look out of place in the context of their surroundings.

In design terms, these properties are considered to be fairly attractively designed when viewed from the front, and should not cause any visual detriment to the surrounding area. The use of more than one material for the front elevations would help to add interest to the street scene and avoid the creation of a large uninterrupted mass. There is therefore no objection to the proposal on the basis of Policy EC2 or RDG8.

RDG1 requires the plot sizes for new development to be informed by the prevailing character of plot sizes. Where there is a distinct character of development which creates an exceptionally strong pattern, development must not result in a disruption to this pattern. Where there is no clear pattern of plot sizes, the size of the plot should be proportionate to the size of the dwelling occupying it, having regard to the other relevant sections of the design guidance.

The proposed plots would have widths of some 6.7m and 8.2m across the front elevation of the properties and 8.5m and 9.5m across the rear elevation, which is felt to be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area, where plots are around 8m in width. A plot depth of some 21.5m would not be at great variance with adjacent plots at Nos. 22 and 24 which are some 22.5m deep. No objection is therefore raised to the proposal on the basis of RDG1.

RDG2 requires the space around new development to be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings. Where there is a distinct character of development which creates an exceptionally strong pattern, development must not result in a disruption to this pattern. In forms of development where there is no clear pattern, the space around a dwelling should be proportionate to the size of the dwelling, with at least 1m between the property and the boundary.

The proposal would provide a minimum of 1m between the dwellings and the boundaries of the site which may be considered generous in relation to the character of the surrounding area where dwellings tend to have single storey side projections up to the boundary set back from their front elevations, which appear to be of original construction. No objection is therefore raised on the basis of RDG2.

RDG3 requires proposals to respect established building lines. The properties would not be in advance of the front wall of the adjacent properties therefore no objection is raised on the basis of RDG3.

RDG6 requires appropriate amounts of outdoor amenity space to be provided in proportion to the size of the dwelling. A minimum of 15m² per habitable room should be provided, with a minimum of 50m².

The proposed dwellings would each have four habitable rooms requiring an amenity area of at least 60m². The dwellings would have rear garden areas of approximately 70m² which satisfies this requirement. However, given that the rear garden areas are only slightly larger than the minimum required it would be prudent to withdraw permitted development rights for enlarging the dwellings so that a planning application to the council is required for further development. It is acknowledged that these properties will be council houses initially but they could be sold in the future, at which point occupiers may wish to extend them.

Subject to a condition withdrawing permitted development rights for extensions to the properties, there is no objection to the proposal on the basis of RDG6.

RDG10 requires public and private space to be clearly defined, in the form of a physical means of enclosure and/or change in surface material. The choice of means of enclosure and surface material should be informed by the prevailing character of the area and surrounding forms of enclosure, in terms of materials and positioning, without repeating poor forms of development. Any means of enclosure should not dominate the public realm.

The proposal envisages concrete fence posts and close boarded panels to separate the site from other residential curtilages, which is felt to be visually acceptable and not out of keeping with the surroundings. The front of the site would be open, with no change in surface material between the parking spaces and the general vehicular access and turning area, which would seem to go against the guidance at RDG10. However, the development is located at the end of the street and is not part of a public thoroughfare so it is not considered that this would result in the creation of development with poor legibility. No objection is therefore raised on the basis of RDG10.

RDG11 requires the provision of suitable landscaping for development. Whilst this is primarily aimed at blocks of flats and residential institutions, there may be opportunities to improve the street scene through the provision of appropriate landscaping in developments of single family dwellinghouses.

The proposal would provide rear gardens to the dwellings but the space in front of them would be dedicated to vehicle parking and turning. This might seem to go against RDG11 however the introduction of landscaped areas would reduce space for vehicle parking and turning and therefore would not be appropriate under the circumstances. Furthermore, the new dwellings and their front gardens would not be widely visible from surrounding public vantage points.

As communal landscaping could not be provided without compromising the workability of the parking and would be unlikely to make a positive contribution to the amenity of the area, there is no objection to the proposal on the basis of RDG11.

RDG12 requires parking not to be visually dominant and not to adversely impact upon adjacent residential amenities.

The frontages of the proposed dwellings would be almost entirely used for parking purposes however it is located at the end of an existing residential street so its visual impact would be very modest. Furthermore, there is existing 1.8m high fencing separating the proposed parking area from the existing parking area of No. 24 Windsor Gardens, which is to be retained as part of the development. This would partially screen the proposed parking from wider views so any concerns about the development being dominated by parking would not form a robust reason for refusal as its impact on the amenity of neighbour occupiers would be strictly limited.

Turning to the potential impact of the development on the amenity of surrounding residents in terms of noise and disturbance from vehicular movements, this area was formerly a garage court where there would have been vehicular activity when the garages were in use. The garages are still located on the site, albeit they are in a rather dilapidated condition at the present time. The replacement of 14 garages with four parking spaces is not considered to increase the level of vehicular activity on the site to a degree where adjacent residents' amenity would be adversely affected. Rather, it would likely result in less vehicular activity than when the garages were in beneficial use.

The site has of course been disused for some time so adjacent residents will have become accustomed to the absence of vehicular activity on the land. However, were this application refused, the council could choose to build new garages on the land or simply lay it out as car parking, both of which would reintroduce vehicular activity to the area. In comparison to these

scenarios, it is not considered that the development would result in an unfair level of disturbance being caused to people living nearby, and there is no objection to the proposal on this basis.

Overall, no objection is raised to the proposal on the basis of RDG12.

Impact on neighbours

RDG3 also requires proposals not to cause undue overshadowing or dominance of adjacent residential properties. The proposed dwellings are not considered to be sited such that undue overshadowing or dominance would be caused, and consequently there is no objection on the basis of this part of RDG3.

RDG5 deals with privacy and living conditions. A distance of 9m is required to be provided between first floor windows and the boundary of the site, except in the case of secondary windows and windows serving rooms that require a high degree of privacy where the use of obscure glazing and limited openable parts may be used to prevent overlooking.

The proposal would be fully compliant with this requirement. Subject to a condition requiring the first floor bathroom windows to be obscure glazed and having limited openings, there is no objection to the proposal on the basis of RDG5.

Parking

Policy T8 of the Local Plan requires the provision of parking in accordance with adopted standards. The currently adopted standards are the 2009 County Parking Standards which require the provision of a minimum of two off-street parking spaces for properties with two or more bedrooms. Parking spaces should have dimensions of 2.9m by 5.5m.

Application of these standards is consistent with paragraph 39 of the NPPF because they have been set taking into account local circumstances.

The proposal would make provision for the off-street parking of two cars for each property. This satisfies the minimum parking requirement. The existing garages would be lost, however these are unused and derelict and the proposal will not therefore result in a practical loss of car parking. There is therefore no objection to the proposal on the basis of Policy T8.

Conclusion

The proposed redevelopment of the site raises no significant issues in terms of the impact on surrounding residential occupiers, or in terms of car parking provision or the visual amenity of the area and it is therefore recommended that permission be granted.

I have taken all matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Approval with the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 Prior to construction of the dwellings above foundation level, details or samples of all materials to be used on the external surfaces of the dwellings and on any driveway or forecourt shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.

- 3 The dwellings shall be constructed in accordance with such details as may be approved in relation to condition 2.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.

- 4 The bathroom windows at first floor level in the rear elevations of the dwellings shall be -
 - (i) obscure-glazed to at least level 3 on the Pilkington scale (or such equivalent as may be agreed in writing with the local planning authority); and
 - (ii) non-opening, unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the window is installed

and retained as such thereafter.

REASON: To prevent overlooking of the adjacent residential property.

- 5 Prior to first occupation of the development, the approved car parking areas shall be provided, hard surfaced and drained in accordance with SuDS principles. Thereafter, these areas shall be kept available for the parking of vehicles and not used for any other purpose.

REASON: To make and retain provision for parking off the highway to ensure that additional parking in surrounding streets does not occur, and in the interest of sustainable drainage.

- 6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended, no development of the type specified in Class A of Part 1 of the Second Schedule to that Order (or the equivalent provisions of any statutory instrument revoking, amending or re-enacting that Order) shall be carried out without the express permission of the local planning authority.

REASON: In view of the constrained nature of the site the local planning authority considers that uncontrolled enlargement of the accommodation could result in an unacceptable reduction in rear garden sizes.

Informatives

- 1 The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern within the application (as originally submitted) and negotiating, with the Applicant, acceptable amendments to the proposal to address those concerns. As a result, the Local Planning Authority has been able to grant planning permission for an acceptable proposal, in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.

ITEM 2

Application Number:	18/0339/FUL
Address:	26 Queensmere Thundersley Benfleet Essex SS7 3XR (Victoria Ward)
Description of Development:	Single storey rear extension and wheel chair entrance with access ramp to side
Applicant:	Mr Richard Waters
Case Officer:	Mr Stephen Garner
Expiry Date:	12.07.2018

Summary

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension with a wheelchair entrance and access ramp to the side. It is considered that the proposal is acceptable and the application is therefore recommended for APPROVAL.

The application is presented to the committee because it is on council owned land and the application has been submitted by the council.

Site Visit

It is not considered necessary for members to visit the site prior to determination of the application.

Introduction

The application concerns a semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Queensmere some 35m west of the junction with Abbotswood.

The site is largely of a regular shape having a frontage of some 8.4m and a maximum depth of some 71.5m. The rear westerly corner of the plot is cut into by a block of garages. The frontage of the site is served by a dropped kerb and has a small hard surfaced area which is capable of providing on-site parking for up to two vehicles.

The area is characterised by hipped roof semi-detached dwellings of a similar design.

The Proposal

Permission is sought for the demolition of an existing small rear extension and its replacement by a larger single storey flat roofed rear extension with wheelchair entrance and access ramp to the side.

The rear extension would have a total depth of 6.9m and extend across the full width of the property, which is some 5.1m, and have a maximum height of 2.8m. It is required to provide a bathroom, bedroom and separate toilet to meet disability requirements. The development would be finished externally in render with UPVC windows to match the existing dwelling.

The access ramp is shown set back 7.3m from the front of the dwelling and would have an inclined section measuring 2.4m leading to a flat platform 1.5m deep with a height of 0.2m. On the side of this access ramp, a galvanised hand rail painted yellow would be provided. The ramp is to provide access to a door on the side of the property and would project some 1.5m past the flank wall of the dwelling.

Supplementary Documentation

This application is not accompanied by any supplementary documentation.

Planning History

None

Local Plan Allocation

Residential

Relevant Policies and Government Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework

Paragraphs

56 to 58 Good Design

Current Local Plan

EC2 Design

H12 Housing Development – Design and Layout

T8 Parking Provision

Residential Design Guidance

RDG2 Space Around Dwellings

RDG3 Building Lines

RDG6 Amenity Space

RDG8 Detailing

RDG12 Parking and Access

Consultation

One statutory consultation response received:

Legal Services

- o The council owns the applicant property.
- o The council also owns neighbouring properties to the east and north of the applicant property.
- o No objection to the proposed development.

Public Consultation

One neighbour response received with the following comments:

- o Once the outbuilding is taken down it will leave a section of the boundary unsecured so during the course of building the boundary should be secured until a permanent wall is in place.
- o No objection in principle to the proposed development.

Comments on Consultation Responses

The area of boundary exposed after demolition of the small outbuilding would be small, no more than 2m in size, and is to be replaced by the solid wall of the proposed single storey rear extension. The council is only responsible for the eastern boundary of the site however the applicant has confirmed that any fencing on the western side that is damaged during construction will be repaired/replaced.

Evaluation of Proposal

The main issue with this application is whether the design of the proposed development and its impact on neighbours.

Policy EC2 of the Council's Adopted Local Plan seeks a high standard of design in all alterations to existing buildings. In particular, regard is to be given to the scale, density, siting, design, layout and external materials of any development, which shall be appropriate to its setting and which should not harm the character of its surroundings. This is consistent with paragraphs 56 to 58 of the NPPF.

Policy H17 states that in assessing the design aspects of proposals for housing, the Local Planning Authority will have regards to adopted design guidelines.

RDG2 states that space around a new development should be informed by the prevailing character of space around dwellings.

RDG8 requires the provision of detailing elements to be consistent with the overall architectural approach of the dwelling.

In design terms the proposal is uninspiring and rather utilitarian. However, it is to be finished externally to match the existing dwelling and given its location at the rear would have no impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Queensmere is characterised by semi-detached dwellings that were constructed with good levels of isolation space to their side although several of these dwellings now have garages or side extensions in this location.

The only element of the proposal that would project past the side elevation of the dwelling into the existing isolation space on its eastern side is the wheelchair access ramp, which is set back 7.3m from the front elevation of the dwelling. It would occupy only part of the side isolation space and given its small size the visual impact of the ramp would be minimal.

No objection is raised to the proposal under EC2, RDG2 and RDG8.

RDG3 requires proposals to respect established building lines. Development should not result in excessive overshadowing or dominance to any elevation of an adjoining property.

The proposed rear extension extends some 7m past the rear wall of the original dwelling and therefore has the potential to dominate the outlook of the adjoining occupiers. However, this property already has a rear extension some 1.5m deep and a rear canopy which protrudes some 3.3m beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling.

The proposed extension therefore extends some 2.3m beyond the rear of the adjacent dwelling's canopy.

Whilst the canopy may not always be retained, which would result in the proposal projecting past this neighbour by some 5.5m, with a modest height of only 2.8m it is considered that the proposal would not unacceptably dominate the outlook of the neighbour.

The proposed development is orientated to the north east of the adjoining dwelling and would therefore result in no overshadowing.

No objection is raised on the basis of RDG3.

RDG6 seeks to ensure the retention of adequate private amenity space/area to serve the needs of the dwelling occupiers. Amenity space is provisioned on the basis of 15m² for each habitable room contained in the dwelling.

The proposal would provide the dwelling with 6 habitable rooms which generates a requirement for 90m² of amenity space. An area of some 100m² is to be retained to the rear of the property and therefore the proposal is fully compliant with RDG6.

Policy T8 requires adopted parking standards to be taken into account. The current adopted Essex Parking Standards require a minimum of 2 spaces for properties with 2 or more bedrooms.

RDG12 seeks to ensure that access to all forms of development is safe and convenient for all users.

The applicant site currently has a small hard surfaced area which is capable of providing two off street parking spaces.

The use of the space to the side of the dwelling could hinder access to the wheelchair access ramp however it is unlikely this second space will be used. Were a second space required there is plenty of space across the front of the site to expand the parking area and maintain access to the wheelchair access ramp in the future if this is so required. Therefore, no objection is raised to the proposal under policy T8 or RDG12.

Conclusion

The proposal is required to meet disability requirements and meets all relevant council policies and design guidance. No objection to the proposal has been made by neighbours and it is therefore recommended that permission be granted.

I have taken all other matters raised by interested parties into consideration, but none are sufficient to outweigh the considerations that led to the recommendation.

My Recommendation is Approval with the following conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun on or before the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

REASON: This condition is imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- 2 The materials used in any exterior work shall be of similar appearance to the materials used in the construction of the exterior of the existing dwellinghouse.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity.

Informatives

- 1 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 determining the proposal in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out within the National Planning Policy Framework.