

Planning Committee

Thursday, 17 November 2022

Attendees: Councillor Lyn Barton, Councillor Nigel Chapman, Councillor Helen Chuah, Councillor Michael Lilley, Councillor Jackie Maclean, Councillor Roger Mannion, Councillor Leigh Tate

Apologies: Councillor Steph Nissen, Councillor Martyn Warnes

Substitutes: Councillor Richard Kirkby-Taylor (for Councillor Steph Nissen), Councillor Sam McLean (for Councillor Martyn Warnes)

953 Site Visit

A site visit was undertaken for application 221294 – 43 Roman Road, Colchester, Essex, CO1 1UR on the 14 November 2022 and was attended by Councillors Lilley, Barton, S. McLean and Kirkby-Taylor.

954 Minutes of Previous Meeting

The Minutes of the meeting held on the 22 September 2022 and 10 October 2022 were confirmed as a true record.

955 221294 43 Roman Road, Colchester, Essex, CO1 1UR

The Committee considered an application for a single storey rear extension. The application was referred to the Planning Committee as the application had been called in by Councillor Mark Goacher for the following reasons (summarised in the committee report):

- Impact on light into Neighbours gardens
- Excessive height
- Limited garden space would remain
- The drawings do not fully represent the proposed extension (half-light basement, back doors, steps not shown on plans)
- The proposed extension, along with an existing pergola in the rear garden, represents an over-development within a conservation area.

The Committee had before it a report and amendment sheet in which all information was set out.

Simon Cairns, Development Manager, presented the report and assisted the Committee in its deliberations. The Committee heard that the dwelling was a terraced frontage development 19th Century Townhouse in the Conservation area that had yet to be extended to the rear. The proposed extension had been amended since the application had been first submitted to create a smaller extension that was before the Committee and resulted in an improved relationship with the building and its

surroundings. He explained that the proposal included a twin gabled rear form with glazed rear elevations with the extension replacing the side boundary wall. It was noted that the property to the north had also been extended, where no objection had been received from them but added that the pergola in the garden as shown in the presentation was not part of the application. The Development Manager concluded by outlining that the officer recommendation was for approval as detailed in the report.

Rosie White addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in opposition to the application. The Committee heard that the property was currently up for sale and that the application site and the property immediately south were a unique pair of townhouses which had remained unchanged since they had been built 130 years ago. The speaker elaborated that the proposal would be 1.5 storeys tall with a height of 4 metres and 6 metres wide and would be overbearing to the neighbouring properties. The speaker raised concern that the area and specifically the walls were protected by Article 4 but would be destroyed by the proposal and noted that although there were extensions on other dwellings none of them had half light extensions or black metal doors. The speaker concluded by drawing attention to the fact that the materials for the roof had not been detailed and that part of the wall at the rear of the garden could contain parts of the original roman city wall.

James Pilgrim addressed the Committee pursuant to the provisions of Planning Committee Procedure Rule 8 in support of the application. The Committee heard that the property was sold subject to conditions and that the proposal was in compliance with all of the Councils policies.

Councillor Goacher attended and with the consent of the Chair addressed the Committee. The Committee heard that the length of the extension did concern the Ward Member and whether it was in-keeping with the area especially with regards to the doors and their association with the conservation area. The Committee heard how there was a request for clarification on the wall, its origins and status and queried whether the half light basement had been taken into consideration when coming to a decision. The visiting Member concluded by contending that the height of the extension was overbearing.

The Development Manager addressed the Committee responding the points made and questions asked by speakers. The Committee heard that the pergola was a matter that would be subject to a separate application whereby interested parties would be able to comment at that time. He added that the rear wall of the property did follow the line of the old Roman wall but that this had been rebuilt with brick in the 19th Century and that this application would not affect any of the instances of original fabric that were still in existence. The Development Manager noted that although the height of the street front was at a different level the rear elevation of the property the rear garden was considered to be ground level for the extension. It was noted that although the extension had not been designed to look Victorian and that using the 45 degree rule in planning lighting would not be effected for the basement. The Development Manager advised the Committee that many of the houses on Roman

Road had extensions and that the form of the development would not be intrusive and its design was acceptable and that the proposed French doors dark colouring would be visually recessive. The Committee were asked to note that although part of the Victorian brick wall would be lost it was not a feature of scarcity within the borough but appreciated the desire to preserve it.

The Committee debated the application on the issues including the length of the proposed extension being approximately two thirds of the size of the existing footprint of the building, the basement and the impact of light this would have on it as a living area.

The Development Manager advised the Committee that although the property was up for sale this was not a material consideration as the permission for the proposal was tied to the land and not to the owner.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

956 222402 44 Marlowe Way, Colchester, Essex, CO3 4JP

The Committee considered an application for the replacement of an existing flat roof single storey rear extension with a proposed two storey extension. The application was referred to the Planning Committee as the Applicant was an Officer of the Council.

The Committee had before it a report in which all information was set out.

RESOLVED (UNANIMOUSLY) that the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report.