

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
8 January 2009 at 6:00pm**

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**Part A**

(open to the public including the press)

**Pages**

**11. Amendment Sheet**

See Final Amendment Sheet.

**No Page  
Numbers**



# AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee  
8 January 2009

## AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

### **LATE AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THIS AMENDMENT SHEET AND ARE SHOWN AS EMBOLDENED**

#### 7.1 081868 – Wyvern, Maytree & Wyvern, Crown Street, Dedham

Further amended plans have now been received as expected during the report. Consequently, the wording of Condition 16 would need to be changed from reference to drawing 06a to drawing 06b on any permission granted.

In the report paragraph 7.2 refers to the desired removal of the porch on “Maytree”. This has been shown on the amended plans. The plans also show changes to the windows on the front elevation so that these have a uniform appearance and the openings pattern has been properly aligned. This has satisfactorily enhanced the front elevation in order to resolve concerns in this respect. Paragraph 10.10 refers to waethboarding on the rear “extension” element, but this has now been changed to brick, which is more satisfactory.

In addition to these changes the applicant has confirmed that they will not be speaking at the committee meeting but have asked for the following to be read:

“Thank you for your letter of 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2008 advising that the scheme presented is programmed for placement before the Planning Development Control Committee with a favourable Officer recommendation.

Taking into account the extensive work carried out by way of our pre application discussions with your goodselves and other materially interested parties, we feel it unnecessary for us to speak at the Committee.

We would like to convey, on behalf of all parties involved in the development design to date, an expressions of gratitude for the manner in which both your Authority has dealt with the processing of the scheme before determination and various consultees that we have approached throughout the early design stages that have, from our perspective, enabled the scheme to be authored that will hopefully enhance environmental quality of this part of Dedham for not only present generations but for future generations to enjoy.

All I could ask that you do as part of Committee presentation is say thanks to various people involved in consultation and allowing us to work alongside them to produce a scheme for the site.

Kindest regards

Andrew Stevenson”

#### 7.2/7.3 – 081870 & 081792 – 172 Lexden Road, Colchester

Objections have been received from the occupier of 152 Lexden Road on the following grounds (Officer comments in response are in italics):

1. Demolition of an historic timber framed building in one of the more historic parts of Lexden

*Officer comment - The building is not Listed and being set back from the main road its contribution to the street scene is less than buildings on the frontage. Its removal provides the opportunity to provide a new building to enclose the gap on the frontage. The agent has written to indicate that the current owners first purchased the building to restore it and a full structural survey indicated that it required a new roof and new external render skin and that signs of wet and dry rot were evident. Subsequent investigations indicated that the building was beyond repair and it was preferable to demolish it.*

2. Proposed development is too intensive and in particular houses on the frontage have too small gardens

*Officer comment - Plot 1 on the frontage was approved on appeal with a rear garden below minimum standard (70 square metres) which the Inspector considered nevertheless provided a satisfactory secure and private area for outdoor enjoyment. The other proposed property would have a rear garden of 90m<sup>2</sup> which albeit also below standard might be difficult to resist given the Inspector's judgment on the other plot.*

3. New access will cause additional hazards on this busy road and opposite bus stop.

*Officer comment - As discussed in the Report this development would result in one new access serving 4 dwellings instead of two accesses serving two dwellings. The Highway Authority has not raised objection to the proposals on safety grounds.*

4. Proposed buildings on frontage are poor and inappropriate design- curious mix of cottage and neo-Victorian design

*Officer comment - The design for Plot 1 is the same as that approved on appeal. The design of Plot 4 by reason of its scale, proportions, height and materials, is considered to be in character with its immediate neighbours. The scheme was discussed at pre-application stage with the former Head of Conservation and Design who considered it to be acceptable in these respects.*

5. Proposals neither preserve nor improve quality of the Conservation Area.

*Officer comments: it is considered that the scheme would enhance the frontage in a Conservation Area by providing new appropriately designed buildings.*

Lexden Conservation Group object to proposals for following reasons:

1. Over-development of site- garden size of 4 bedroom house too small.
2. Front elevations onto Lexden Road unsympathetic to location in a Conservation Area
3. Road access is opposite a bus stop used by 9-10 buses an hour on weekdays
4. Proposed road access is often blocked by traffic queuing to get onto roundabout

*Officer comments- the issues raised have been addressed in the report and above.*

5. No consideration of parking for visitors.

*Officer comments- parking provision is made at two spaces per dwelling, which is considered satisfactory. There is no requirement for visitor parking spaces in schemes of this size.*

Additional conditions to be added to the Planning decision recommendation as follows.

All external joinery shall be of painted timber, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (Ref. C75)

Reason: To ensure that the development preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved the pedestrian access ways serving Nos. 164-170 Lexden Road as shown on the approved plans shall be provided and thereafter maintained open at all times.

Reason: In order to ensure that pedestrian access to properties adjoining the application site is provided and maintained in the future.

7.4 081939 – 28 Cape Close, Colchester

**An e mail has been received stating:-**

**"Having viewed your report to Conditionally approve the above application I feel very strongly that not enough consideration was given to the petition signed by 13 residents and the letter from myself and my husband objecting to the visual appearance of the proposed large rendered extension in an area of all brick houses. As 28, Cape Close is adjacent to Jeffrey Close the side view will be a Large expanse of wall fronting onto Jeffrey Close within 2 metres of the boundary and well outside the existing building line. Recent extensions to other houses in the immediate area which are visible from the roadways have been built with brick and match or blend with the original brickwork well.**

**No. 28 is already part yellow and part red brick.**

**I understand that a bungalow conversion to a house, nearby, in Rudsdale Way was originally intended to be rendered but was approved in brick and this dwelling stands a good 20 metres from any roadway."**