



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Tuesday 13 January 2026
Time: 5:30pm
Location: Parish Offices, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QX

Members to be present:

Cllr. Elliot Costa (Chair)	Cllr Cllr Debby Rye
Cllr Lisa Skingsley-Morgan	Cllr Erika Skingsley
#Cllr Tosin Amuludun	# Cllr Faiza Rivzi (Vice Chair)

Clerk to the Council: Jason Selvarajah MSc

Acting Clerk to the Council: Cllr Celina Jefcoate

Members of the Public and Councillors were asked to **NOTE** that in accordance with Standing Orders 3 (i) and the Local Government Transparency Code 2015, photographing, recording, broadcasting, transmitting or otherwise reporting the proceeding of a meeting may take place.

Councillors were asked to **NOTE** that in the exercise of their functions, they must take note of the following: equal opportunities; crime and disorder; human rights; health and safety and biodiversity

PL319/25 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and **ACCEPTED** from Cllr Lorraine Clarke

PL320/25 - OTHER ABSENCES

Cllr Rochelle Hodds, Cllr Osman Ali

PL321/25 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are asked to declare any Interest or Disclosable Pecuniary Interest which they may have in any of the items under consideration at this meeting. See notes at the end of the Agenda.

PL322/25 - MINUTES

Members **CONFIRMED** the minutes of the meeting held 11 December 2025 ([Appendix 1](#)) as an accurate record of what took place

PL323/25 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

To **CONSIDER** the following applications received for the weeks ending 5, 12, 19 and 24 December 2025

PL324/25 - EPF/2519/25 - 13, Brook Parade, Chigwell, IG7 6PF - Removal/variation of conditions - Section 73 TCPA

Variation of Condition 5 Balcony railing height and design of EPF/2701/19 Allowed on Appeal (Construction of an additional storey comprising 6 two-bedroom flats).

Seven objections were received from residents

Chigwell Parish Council:

Balcony railings The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECT** on the basis that the proposal, as described, would introduce unacceptable external detailing and an unsympathetic design outcome at a visually prominent upper level, undermining the high-quality, restrained appearance that the Inspector found acceptable. The Parish Council also considers that the application fails to provide a transparent and accurate basis for assessment where the installed balcony treatment is reported to differ significantly from what was previously approved, and where the “variation” route appears to be used to retrospectively validate unauthorised works rather than demonstrate a coherent, policy-compliant design solution

Wider planning control concern: The Parish Council asks the Local Planning Authority to give substantial weight to the apparent pattern of non-compliance. Condition 8 expressly prevents commencement until a Construction Method Statement is approved, and the Parish Council's published officer report for EPF/1679/25 concluded that Condition 8 could not be discharged. The Parish Council considers it contrary to the public interest to vary conditions to suit an uncontrolled build on a live, occupied parade where public safety and safe access are critical, and requests that enforcement action continues to ensure compliance with the appeal permission and protection of residents, businesses, and highway users.

PL325/25 - EPF/2527/25 - 13, Brook Parade, Chigwell, IG7 6PF - Removal/variation of conditions - Section 73 TCPA

Variation of Condition 2 Increase in height of EPF/2701/19 Allowed on Appeal (Construction of an additional storey comprising 6 two-bedroom flats).

Seven objections were received from residents

Chigwell Parish Council:

STRONG OBJECTION

Increase in height The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECT** on the basis that the proposed increase in height would materially alter the envelope assessed and found acceptable at appeal and would be likely to cause harm to the character and appearance of Brook Parade and the wider street scene. The appeal decision's design conclusions relied on the proportions, roofline and overall balance shown on the approved plans. The design rationale relied upon by the Planning Inspector would

no longer apply. Increasing height risks creating a more dominant and intrusive roof addition, disrupting the stepped profile of the parade and exacerbating perceived scale as the build progresses along the frontage where the cumulative effect of additional height is likely to be more pronounced. The Parish Council consider the submission does not provide sufficient clarity and confidence that the true height, massing and resulting visual impact have been accurately and transparently presented for assessment.

Wider planning control concern: The Parish Council asks the Local Planning Authority to give substantial weight to the apparent pattern of non-compliance. Condition 8 expressly prevents commencement until a Construction Method Statement is approved, and the Parish Council's published officer report for EPF/1679/25 concluded that Condition 8 could not be discharged. The Parish Council considers it contrary to the public interest to vary conditions to suit an uncontrolled build on a live, occupied parade where public safety and safe access are critical, and requests that enforcement action continues to ensure compliance with the appeal permission and protection of residents, businesses, and highway users.

PL326/25 - EPF/2573/25 - 14, Brook Way, Chigwell, IG7 6AW

Erection of new replacement dwelling and outbuilding with associated external works; following demolition of the existing dwelling and garages.

Chigwell Parish Council

The Council **OBJECTS** to the proposal. Members took into account of the pre application advice published with the application and the history of earlier refusals on the site. While the applicants say the scheme has been reduced, we do not consider the changes go far enough to address the underlying concerns.

The main issue remains the scale and intensity of what is proposed on this plot. The combination of a large new dwelling arranged over several levels with extensive basement accommodation, together with a substantial outbuilding and parking platform, would amount to overdevelopment. It would sit uncomfortably on this corner site and would not reflect the prevailing form of development in Brook Way and Brook Rise.

Members also concerned about the effect on the street scene. This is a prominent plot and the building's bulk, width and overall presence would be very apparent from both roads. The proposal reads as a much more assertive and dominant form than the existing house, and the mix of features and materials described does not, by itself, make the overall massing acceptable.

The Parish Council is particularly worried about the impact on neighbours' living conditions. Increased depth and height, together with the way the building is laid out close to boundaries, creates a real risk of an overbearing effect and loss of outlook and privacy. The extensive leisure and plant uses proposed within the basement, including pool related equipment, also raise practical concerns about noise, vibration, ventilation outlets and external plant, none of which is properly resolved at this stage.

Highway and access arrangements are another concern. Multiple access points and more intensive use of the site are likely to increase vehicle movements at a junction location where visibility and pedestrian safety matter. We also expect significant disruption from excavation and basement construction, including spoil removal, deliveries and contractor parking, and the application needs to demonstrate convincingly that these impacts can be managed without harm to neighbours and the wider area.

Finally, the scale of excavation and the extent of hard surfacing make drainage and ground conditions critical. The Basement Impact Assessment does not provide sufficient certainty that the scheme meets Local Plan expectations for basement and lightwell development. It is explicitly desk based, confirms no site investigation has been undertaken, and notes that the depth of existing foundations is unknown. Given the proximity of neighbouring buildings and the extent of excavation proposed, the reliance on assumptions and a “watching brief” is not an adequate substitute for site specific investigation and a clearly defined mitigation strategy.

Even on the BIA’s own conclusions, the proposal introduces avoidable flood and drainage vulnerabilities. It identifies a low surface water flood risk at the rear where the lightwell and external basement stairs are proposed and accepts these are potential ingress points, yet the report also states the site drainage is unknown and assumes flows will continue as existing. With increased impermeable surfacing, a detailed SuDS and drainage design is required now to demonstrate no increased flood risk on site or off site, and to show how lightwells and external access will be protected without reliance on retrospective measures.

The application should provide clear and robust evidence that surface water will be properly managed, that basement construction will not create problems for adjoining land, and that any loss of soft landscaping and habitat is properly mitigated. For these reasons, and because the scheme does not overcome the points raised through earlier refusals and pre application advice, Chigwell Parish Council asks Epping Forest District Council to refuse permission.

Cllr Amuluden joined the meeting at 5.45pm

PL327/25 - [EPF/1542/25](#) - 781 Secondhand Shop, Chigwell Road, Chigwell, IG8 8AU

Proposed refurbishment of existing first floor and conversion of rear ground floor into self-contained flat.

Chigwell Parish Council

No objection

PL328/25 - [EPF/2391/25](#) - 30, Hycliffe Gardens, Chigwell, IG7 5HJ

Proposed ground floor rear extension, dormer replacement, roof alterations, outbuildings, external wall insulation, window replacement, and all associated works.

Chigwell Parish Council

No objection

PL329/25 - [EPF/2398/25](#) - 15, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RG

Retrospective application for minor alterations following planning approval.

Chigwell Parish Council

On the grounds the application does not clearly identify the alterations compared to the approved scheme. There are no annotated drawings or clear explanation. As a result members were unable to assess the impact on amenity, privacy, light, noise or scale

PL330/25 - [EPF/2406/25](#) - 19, Stradbroke Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5QU

Replace existing rear conservatory roof and frames onto existing base to provide extension.

Chigwell Parish Council

No objection

PL331/25 - [EPF/2421/25](#) - 2, Stradbroke Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5QX

Retrospective submission for single storey rear extension and basement

Chigwell Parish Council

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on drainage and basement flood-risk grounds. Although the site is Flood Zone 1, the proposals have not been shown to be safe and robust in heavy rainfall or over the lifetime of the development.

The FloodSmart Basement Impact Assessment confirms no site investigation has been undertaken to verify groundwater conditions and key basement levels are estimated (basement floor c. 3.75m bgl, foundations c. 4.25m bgl). The BIA also appears inconsistent with the drainage approach, stating it is not expected that more surface water will be discharged to ground, whereas the SuDS strategy relies on infiltration via a soakaway.

The SuDS report proposes (and suggests it may already be installed) a soakaway of 2.0m (W) x 4.0m (L) x 2.6m (D)(void ratio 0.95) in London Clay. The Parish Council is concerned that infiltration performance has not been demonstrated with site-specific testing, and that the design has limited resilience if infiltration is lower than assumed or if the system silts/clogs over time. In addition, it has not been clearly demonstrated that the soakaway is sufficiently set back from the house/basement foundations; if it is close to the building, there is a risk of damp, undermining or unintended water pathways toward the basement.

No clear, practical exceedance/overflow routing is shown to demonstrate that water would be kept away from the basement and neighbouring land in extreme events or failure.

The BIA recommends waterproof tanking, a collection/pump system and non-return valves; if the Council is minded to approve, these measures (and long-term maintenance) must be secured by condition, together with as-built verification given the retrospective/as-built nature of the works.

For these reasons, the Parish Council requests refusal, or that determination be deferred until robust evidence is provided that the soakaway location and performance, and exceedance arrangements, will function safely and will not increase risk to the host or neighbouring properties.

PL332/25 - [EPF/2422/25](#) - 25, Brook Way, Chigwell, IG7 6AW

Conversion of garage into habitable area and creation of a side access door.

Chigwell Parish Council

No Objection

PL333/25 - [EPF/2430/25](#) - 14, Manor Road, Chigwell, IG7 5PD

Alteration to existing dropped kerb.

Chigwell Parish Council

No Objection

PL334/25 - [EPF/2440/25](#) - 48, Woolhampton Way, Chigwell, IG7 4QJ

Single storey rear extension.

Chigwell Parish Council

No Objection

PL335/25 - [EPF/2451/25](#) - 404, Fencepiece Road, Chigwell, IG7 5DS

Rear extension to existing dwelling to create additional living accommodation over three floors, including new accommodation in roof loft space.

Chigwell Parish Council

The Council **OBJECTS** and asks that significant weight is given to the site's recent planning history, including EPF/2710/22 and the dismissed appeal relating to the refused scheme for demolition and 8 apartments (Revised Scheme to EPF/2761/21). Although this proposal is different, it raises the same core concerns about excessive scale on this plot and the ongoing risk to protected trees.

The Council considers the proposed three-storey rear addition and roof/loft accommodation would result in an over-dominant and unneighbourly form of development, materially increasing the mass and bulk of the dwelling and appearing out of keeping with the established form of development to the rear. The resulting scale is also likely to harm neighbouring amenity through an overbearing impact and increased potential for overlooking and loss of privacy.

The Parish Council remains particularly concerned about the lack of clear, robust and enforceable protection for any Tree Preservation Order tree(s) and their root protection areas, an issue highlighted by previous proposals on this site. Without detailed arboricultural information and a secured method of protection before any works begin, the Council cannot be satisfied the development would avoid direct or indirect harm to protected trees.

PL336/25 - [EPF/2488/25](#) - 138, Trotwood, Chigwell, IG7 5JW

First floor L-shaped wraparound extension and enlargement of existing garage

Chigwell Parish Council

The Parish Council objects to this proposal. The proposed first floor L-shaped wraparound extension, together with the enlargement of the existing garage, represents an unsympathetic and overly dominant form of development that would appear incongruous when read against the host

dwelling. The scale, massing and roof form would create a bulky addition that fails to respect the character and proportions of the original building and would harm the appearance of the property and the wider street scene, contrary to policy DM9 of the EFDC Local Plan. The submission also does not provide adequate street scene context to properly assess how the proposal would sit within its surroundings.

The Council notes the recent refusal of EPF/1821/25 for similar reasons. In the absence of clear and meaningful changes that overcome those concerns, the Parish Council considers the reasons for refusal remain valid and the application should be refused.

PL337/25 - [EPF/2496/25](#) - 9, Tomswood Road, Chigwell, IG7 5QP

First floor front extension and alterations to front fenestration.

Chigwell Parish Council

No Objection

PL338/25 - [EPF/2516/25](#) - 11, St Marys Way, Chigwell, IG7 5BX

Single Storey Side Extension

Chigwell Parish Council

No Objection

PL339/25 - [EPF/2547/25](#) - Roseland Cottage, Gravel Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6DQ

The addition of area of agricultural land as amenity area associated to Roseland Cottage with the creation of a small utility building to cater for the machinery used to care for the land.

Chigwell Parish Council

The Council **OBJECTS** to this proposal. The site lies within the Green Belt and relates to a Grade II listed building, so a high level of justification and assessment is required.

The proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Even if described as modest, an outbuilding of around 11m x 9.5m with a 3.4m ridge is a meaningful addition of built form and, by definition, harms openness. The applicant's "very special circumstances" case relies largely on convenience for storage and land management, which does not amount to an exceptional justification, particularly where the scheme also involves domesticating rural/agricultural land by bringing it into the residential amenity of the cottage. That change of character risks incremental creep (storage, paraphernalia, lighting, informal enclosures, hardstanding), which cumulatively erodes the Green Belt.

The Parish Council is also concerned that the supporting statements downplay heritage impacts. Roseland Cottage and Turnours Hall are both Grade II listed and form a historic grouping; the rural land to the rear contributes to that wider setting and historic character. The Heritage Officer's comments indicate a need for a full heritage assessment before the application can properly be

considered, including setting and cumulative change. At present, the submission does not provide the robust evidence needed to conclude “no harm”.

For these reasons, the Parish Council requests that the application be refused. If approval is contemplated, it should be tightly conditioned to prevent further domestication (no lighting, no fencing/enclosures, no hardstanding/external storage without consent, and removal of permitted development rights for additional structures)

PL340/25 - [EPF/2591/25](#) - 59, Lechmere Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5HA

Proposed erection of 2 no. semi-detached houses and Demolition of existing dwellinghouses.

One objection was received

Chigwell Parish Council

The Council **OBJECTS** to this proposal. Members noted the recent refusals on broadly similar proposals and, although amendments are said to have been made, the scheme would still appear as an overly intensive form of development on a highly visible corner plot with difficult levels. In the Council’s view the overall bulk and proportions would remain out of keeping with the established street scene and would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the Local Plan’s design policies and the NPPF.

Members also remained concerned about highways and parking. The revised submission does not clearly demonstrate compliance with the Essex Parking Guidance 2024 for two 4-bed homes in this connectivity category, in particular the need for genuine visitor provision and workable bay dimensions. The Council’s view is that, in practice, the proposed spaces will be used by residents and visitor demand will spill onto surrounding roads. The layout is also tight and constrained by boundaries/structures, and the information provided does not convincingly show that manoeuvring and door-opening clearances meet the adopted guidance. The proposal is therefore considered to conflict with Local Plan Policy T1.

Finally, the Parish Council was not satisfied that the Habitats Regulations issues have been properly resolved in relation to the Epping Forest SAC, especially recreational pressure. While technical work has been submitted on traffic and air quality, the Council does not consider that the screening position on recreational impacts is robust enough to rule out likely significant effects from the net increase in occupancy within the SAC zone of influence. The Council also noted that any mitigation relied upon must be secured through a completed legal agreement before permission is granted. Until the competent authority can lawfully conclude no adverse effect on integrity, and secure any necessary mitigation in full, the proposal remains contrary to Policy DM2 and the Habitats Regulations

PL341/25 - [EPF/2583/25](#) - 81, Christies, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6DP - Removal/variation of conditions - Section 73 TCPA

Variation of Condition 3 of EPF/2128/25 (Change of use from (Class C3) dwellinghouse to (Class C2) residential institution – to provide boarding accommodation for 6th form international students to live on the school campus).

Chigwell Parish Council

No objection

Planning History:

#Cllr Skingsley-Morgan left the meeting 6.23pm

PL342/25 - [EPF/2532/25](#) - 19, Brook Rise, Chigwell, IG7 6AP - Removal/variation of conditions - Section 73 TCPA

Extensions and remodelling of an existing two storey chalet, including the addition of a new roof with a habitable third floor.

Chigwell Parish Council

No objection

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, Prior Approval Applications

#Cllr Skingsley-Morgan rejoined the meeting 6.25pm

PL343/25 - [EPF/2433/25](#) - 3, Barton Close, Chigwell, IG7 6LJ - Prior approval Part 1 Class A.1(ea): Larger home extension

ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

Chigwell Parish Council

No comment

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, the following Approval of Details Reserved by A Condition. This type of application is needed where a condition in a planning permission or a listed building consent requires details of a specified aspect of the development which wasn't fully described in the original application. These details need to be submitted for approval before the development can begin

PL344/25 - None

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, Lawful Development Applications - If a property owner wants to be certain that the existing or proposed use or development of a building is lawful for planning purposes or that their proposal does not require planning permission, they can apply for a 'Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development' (CLEUD) or a 'Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development' (CLPUD)

PL345/25 - None

APPEALS

To consider and **AGREE** the Council's response/further action

PL346/25 - None

Cllr Rizvi joined the meeting at 6.26pm

PL346/25 - ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE NEXT MEETING OR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A DECISION TO BE MADE

PL347/25 - DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

To be confirmed as Thursday 22 January at 6.30pm

Meeting closed at 6.29pm