

# Planning Committee

## Thursday, 18 March 2021

**Attendees:** Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Robert Davidson, Councillor Pauline Hazell, Councillor Cyril Liddy, Councillor Derek Loveland, Councillor Jackie Maclean, Councillor Martyn Warnes  
**Apologies:** Councillor Philip Oxford  
**Substitutes:** Councillor Gerard Oxford (for Councillor Philip Oxford)

**829                      201753                      7 Lexden Grove, Colchester**

The Committee considered an application for the erection of two-storey front and rear extension, the increased width of the existing side box dormer, and the porch. The Committee had considered the application at its 21 January meeting but had deferred the application for further negotiation. A report setting out information about the application and the outcome of the negotiation was before the committee.

The Committee members had been provided with photographs of the site taken by the Planning Officer to assist in their assessment of the impact and suitability of the proposals.

Mr Sedani, the applicant addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application.

Mr Sedani stated he had been a local resident for ten years and had applied for approval for an extension in January. He had listened to the Committee's feedback from then and had decided that rather than appealing the decision he would work with everyone including neighbours to ensure good relationships. Cost had been involved and the redesign had moved the proposed extension to the other side of the property. Criteria under planning guidance had been met; there were no privacy or light issues, and vegetation was unaffected. There was proper provision for car parking and plenty of garden space. He was not looking to overdevelop.

Councillor Lissimore attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Committee.

Councillor Lissimore said that since this had been considered at a previous Planning Committee the applicant had moved the extension from one side to the other. She thanked Mr Sedani for engaging with neighbours and changing the plans.

Residents still had some concerns over the development and in particular the front of

the building but it was understood that this did not constitute a planning reason for refusal.

Councillor Lissimore suggested that consideration be given to the removal of Permitted Rights for future developments and the addition of obscure glass up to 1.7 metres near the dormer on the upper floor.

Chris Harden, Senior Planning Officer, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations.

The Senior Planning Officer shared a presentation with members including plans, aerial views and photographs of the site, as well as drawings to allow comparison of the current submission with the previous application. He highlighted those differences and pointed out the elevations proposed. He explained that the submission now was 4.4 metres larger overall.

Three further letters had been received from residents whose concerns were around over development, the increased size of the house and reduction in garden space, the increase in the size of the front extension, parking and the street scene. Also it was felt to be out of scale and not in keeping with the rest of Lexden Grove.

The Senior Planning Officer had assessed that the front extension was acceptable and did not project too far so was not out of keeping with the street scene, the rear extension was not dominating, did not have an overbearing effect on the neighbouring property and met the 45 degree rule. The overall design was satisfactory.

He clarified that the interior glass walkway was included to add light. A condition to add obscure glazing of 1.7 metres to the element of the walkway where it projects could be added as well as a condition for how parking would be laid out. It was noted that the parking space remaining met the higher of the recommended standards.

Garden space remaining would be 140 metres which was above the 100 metre standard.

He recommended approval with 3 additional conditions:

Obscure glazing up to 1.7 m in height across glazed walkway;

Details of car parking layout to be submitted and approved;

Removal of Permitted Development Rights for further additions/alterations to the house.

The Committee acknowledged that the applicant had taken on board neighbours' and the Committee's comments and thanked him. Overall the Committee agreed the application was reasonable and that permission should be granted.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS) that planning permission be approved subject to the conditions in the officer's report and with the addition of the following conditions:

Obscure glazing be provided up to 1.7 m in height at the end of the glazed walkway where it projects beyond the existing gables of the rear of the dwelling;

Details of car parking layout to be submitted and approved;

Removal of Permitted Development rights for further additions/alterations to the house

**830 Applications Determined in Accordance with Officer Scheme of Delegation**

Simon Cairns, Development Manager reported that one approval had been made in relation to Queen Street and that details of this had been provided in the report.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS) that the applications that had been determined under the revised scheme of delegation that were listed in the Appendix to the report be noted.