

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

**Planning Consent
for
Side 1 ½ Storey Extension, Rear Single Storey Extension, Front & Rear
Dormer Extensions**

5 Elm Grove, Nayland, COLCHESTER CO6 4LL

Feb 2024

Agent: Andrew Brinkley
Suffolk Building Design Ltd
11 East Street
Sudbury
Suffolk
07989345664

Applicant: Mr & Mrs A Pear

Introduction

Further to the previously withdrawn planning application (ref: DC/23/04998) and subsequent pre-application advice request (ref: DC/24/00121), a revised planning application submission for the extension and improvement of 5 Elm Grove, Nayland is now provided. This new application seeks to address the concerns raised in the two previous submissions and demonstrates compliance with Policy LP03 of the Joint Local Plan. This revised scheme now proposes a 1.5 storey side extension, single storey rear extension and front dormer window extensions.

Policy LP03 of the Joint Local Plan is supportive of extensions to existing dwellings provided they are:

- a) Incorporate a high standard of design which maintains or enhances the character and appearance of the buildings, street scene and surroundings;
- b) Will not result in over-development of the plot and will retain suitable amenity space. The cumulative effects of a number of extensions or conversions within the plot will be taken into account;
- c) Will not unacceptably affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers; and
- d) Ensure sufficient parking spaces and turning spaces (where required) are retained or provided.

Each of these points is addressed in turn.

a) High Design Standards

Whether a scheme meets high standards of design is inherently subjective and without prescriptive standards like parking space sizes for example. As such it is based on consideration of the character and appearance of the surrounding properties and area. In this case, it is evident that, whilst the property is one half of a semi detached pair, the pair of properties are currently not symmetrical. Also, in the surrounding area, there is a mix of property design, foot print and positioning including various additions/extensions all of which creates a varied character and appearance. It is in this context that the proposed development should be considered.

The pre-application response from the Council confirms that the box dormers, single storey rear extension and roof light serving the stair case could be supported. These elements have therefore been retained from the pre-application scheme. Furthermore, the principle of a 1.5 storey side extension was also acceptable, albeit with some suggested changes, together with other amendments to the front elevation, as follows:

- The roof line now replicates that of the existing property.
- The depth of the extension is more close to that of the existing building, maintaining a small set back
- Matching box dormers are proposed for consistency
- A roof light has also been omitted on the front elevation.

For reasons outlined below, and the fact that the necessity for a garage replacement was not mentioned as part of the previous withdrawn planning application, the inclusion of an integral garage is not considered necessary and so a single, central, window has been retained.

With these changes, it is considered that the proposed development meets the required standards for design such that it would not impact on the character and appearance of the area.

b) Retention of Suitable Amenity

Over-development and the ability to extend the existing property without impact on existing amenity of the property has not previously been raised as an issue with either the previous application or the pre-application response, and it is also considered that this would be the case for these revised proposals. A single storey extension to the rear would utilise a small area of the garden but the vast majority of the garden would remain open and free from built form. The proposed 1.5 storey side extension largely utilises the area formerly occupied by the garage (now demolished).

There would be a minimal reduction in the overall garden space for the property and, as such, the proposals would not constitute over development of the plot and would retain suitable amenity space. The proposals therefore comply with bullet point b).

c) Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Concerns had been raised with regards to the potential for unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity in consideration of the previous application - the 1.5 storey rear extension was considered to unacceptably impact on both No.5 Ash Rise (property to the rear) and No 4 Elm Grove (adjoining).

Amendments have therefore been made to address this issue.

The 1.5 storey rear extension which brought above ground floor development closer to both the neighbouring properties has been removed. This has been replaced by the proposed 1.5 storey side extension. The additional upper floor window of this side extension would be in line with the main rear elevation of the existing property, set back from that of existing 1.5 storey element to the rear by some 2.6 metres, making a total distance of 8 metres to the rear boundary of the garden. This rear-facing window has also been included on the advice contained in the pre-application response.

In addition, a single storey extension only is now included to the rear closest to the boundary with No. 4 Elm Grove. This element is as per the pre-application submission which was considered acceptable.

On the basis of the above it considered that the proposals would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

d) Sufficient Parking

The garage relating to the existing property has already been demolished. It is not proposed to replace the garage as part of the proposals but instead ensure that one parking space is provided on plot that meets the parking standards. This is not currently the case for the existing property, or indeed a number of the neighbouring properties.

The pre-application response suggested that an integral garage be included such that 2 parking spaces could be retained on plot. However, this would not actually be the case. There have never been 2 spaces on the plot that meet standards; the demolished garage was only 2.53 metres wide by 4.98 metres in length (internal) and the driveway, a maximum of 4.5 metres in length. There was never actually any space on the plot that would meet the Suffolk Parking Standards, where the internal width for the garage was minimum of 3 metres and the driveway a minimum of 5 metres in length to be classed as a parking space. Parking would previously have overlapped with the public footway, as is evidenced at a number of properties around the estate.

The integral garage and parking space in front proposed in the pre-application response would also not meet these standards to create 2 spaces. Whilst the garage could be the correct size, the remaining driveway length to the back of the footway would only be 4.5 metres. As such there would still only be one policy compliant space being created. Furthermore, as is well known and acknowledged in the Suffolk Parking Standards, garages even when policy compliant in size, are often not used for parking. It is therefore considered that having a policy compliant driveway parking space, providing 1 parking space to standard is a betterment on the existing position of the property.

The ability to create an additional area of permeable paving with permitted developments, subject to restrictions and conditions of the General Permitted Development Order Schedule 2, Part 1, Class F, provides the opportunity for a second space to be provided on plot.

As such, it is considered that sufficient parking, and indeed betterment to that of the existing position, can be provided as part of the proposed development.

In view of the above, it is considered that these revised proposals now meet the requirements of Policy LP03 and therefore should be approved accordingly.