



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 26 March 2026
Time: 6.30pm
Location: Parish Offices, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QX

Members to be present:

Cllr. Elliot Costa (Chair)	#Cllr Faiza Rivzi (Vice Chair)
#Cllr.Osman Ali	Cllr Tosin Amuludun
Cllr Celina Jefcoate	Cllr Lisa Morgan-Skinsley
#Cllr Erika Skingsley	#Cllr Rochelle Hodds

Clerk to the Council and Proper Officer: Jason Selvarajah MSc

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

1. **PL278/25 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

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

2. **PL279/25 - OTHER ABSENCES**

3. **PL280/25 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

4. **PL281/25 - MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held 12 March 2026 ([Appendix 1](#)) were **AGREED** as a true representation of what took place

5. **PL282/25 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Eight members of the public were in attendance and one member of the public was in attendance and raised issues with an apparent lack of ongoing enforcement regarding the pool at Hainault Hall which was refused retrospective planning and the prolonged delay to the subsequent appeal. The matter was referred to the Clerk and the relevant District Councillor

To **CONSIDER** the following applications received for the weeks ending 6 and 13 March 2026

6. **PL283/25 - [EPF/2501/24](#) - Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College, Roding Lane, Chigwell, Essex IG7 6BQ**

Proposed new special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) school including playing fields alongside a landscape led enabling residential development including conversion of existing college building to residential, partial demolition of existing outbuildings, provision of flexible Class F2 floorspace and associated works.

REVISED PLANS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Members **NOTED** the site was in Green Belt and the Officer's report ([Appendix 2](#))

Chigwell Parish Council

Members, having considered the revised plans and supporting documents submitted in relation to application EPF/2501/24, resolved to maintain and strengthen its **STRONG OBJECTION** to the proposal.

The Parish Council acknowledge that the revised submission includes some improvements, including a reduction in dwelling numbers, the introduction of 27 affordable homes and a stronger case in support of the proposed SEND school.

However, the Parish Council considers that those changes do not overcome the fundamental planning objections to the proposal. The site is not allocated in the Local Plan. It remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt. EFDC's policy comments state that it is not Grey Belt land and that the parcel makes a strong contribution to preventing neighbouring towns from merging. The proposal would therefore remain inappropriate development in Green Belt terms and would reduce the gap between settlements. The revisions do not alter the fact that this is substantial enabling residential development in the Green Belt on an unallocated site. The issue is not confined to the footprint of buildings alone. The policy harm arises from the cumulative effect of buildings, roads, parking areas, domestic curtilages, fencing, lighting, hardstanding and general residential activity.

The Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** because the site is not allocated for this form of development in the Local Plan and remains within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The Council considers that the proposal would amount to substantial and inappropriate development in the Green Belt, would harm openness, and would undermine the important gap between settlements.

In addition, the site remains a poor location for a housing-led development of this scale. EFDC's urban design comments continue to state that the site is isolated from other residential development and that the private car is likely to remain the primary transport mode for most journeys.

That is important because it directly affects how the parking strategy should be judged. A restrained parking approach may be arguable in a town-centre or station-adjacent location with

excellent accessibility and realistic alternatives to the private car. This site is not such a location. The sustainability weakness of the site means that the parking provision must be tested against realistic likely car ownership and car use, not against aspiration alone.

The Council further **STRONGLY OBJECTS** because the site is an isolated and unsustainable location for a residential development of this scale and is likely to remain heavily dependent on the private car.

On the material available, the parking strategy is not simply modest or ambitious. It is materially below the minimum parking requirement that applies to a site with moderate connectivity and is therefore in clear conflict with Policy T1.

The Essex Parking Guidance 2024 applies a zonal approach to residential parking standards based on connectivity level. On the basis that this site falls within the moderate connectivity category, the applicable residential minimum is 1 space plus 0.25 visitor space for each one-bedroom dwelling, and 2 spaces plus 0.25 visitor space for each dwelling with two to four bedrooms. The same guidance also makes clear that parking below minimum standards should only be considered where a developer can demonstrate that trips to and from the site will be by modes other than car and that there will be less parking demand than the minimum standard assumes.

That standard is not met here.

The submitted accommodation schedule shows a total of 209 dwellings, comprising 52 one-bedroom units and 157 two- to four-bedroom units. Applying the moderate-connectivity standards to that mix gives a minimum requirement of approximately 419 car parking spaces including visitor parking. That figure is reached by a straightforward application of the guidance to the submitted dwelling mix.

Against that, the revised parking schedule provides only 162 residential allocated or garage spaces, 2 car club bays and 5 visitor spaces. Even if the two car club bays are counted in the broadest possible way, the scheme still provides only 169 spaces against a minimum requirement of about 419, leaving a shortfall of roughly 250 spaces. That is not a small deviation or a matter of planning judgment at the margins. It is a substantial under provision.

The detail of the schedule makes the conflict even clearer. The parking schedule states that one-bedroom apartment dwellings have no allocated parking space at all. Yet on a moderate-connectivity basis the minimum expectation is one space per one-bedroom dwelling plus visitor parking. The same schedule states that two- and three-bedroom apartment dwellings have only one allocated parking space each, whereas the moderate-connectivity minimum is two spaces per dwelling plus visitor parking. On any fair reading, the proposal is materially non-compliant with the Essex Parking Guidance 2024 and therefore fails to comply with policy T1 of the Local Plan.

It is also not enough for the applicant to point to car club provision, a shuttle bus concept or wider sustainable travel aspirations. The Essex Parking Guidance 2024 allows reduced parking only where there is convincing evidence that actual demand will be lower and that non-car travel will genuinely replace car use. That case is particularly weak here because EFDC's own urban design officer has already concluded that the site is inherently limited in non-car connectivity and likely to remain primarily car-based.

Nor is the issue limited to numbers alone. The design quality of the parking provision remains in question. The current plans show the width of some garages and entrances to be as narrow as 2.5-3m in places rather than the required garage width of 3.4m throughout. The parking spaces shown at p19 of REVISED - Plans Pack #3 - New Residential Dwellings - FINAL.pdf are 3m x 7m

despite being adjacent to a wall and thus required to be 3.4m wide. At a distance of 3-4m from the back edge of the highway much of the layout is contrary to Parking Standards in that it does not demonstrate it will discourage inappropriate parking. The tandem garage is shown as being 9m in length and not the 14m the Parking Standards specify. If garages and the layout of the house parking do not meet the minimum standard, there is a further question as to whether all of the nominal spaces shown can properly be relied upon as compliant and usable parking spaces at all.

The Council therefore also **STRONGLY OBJECTS** on the basis the current proposal does not simply offer a low-parking approach. It materially fails to comply with the Essex Parking Guidance 2024 for a moderate-connectivity site and therefore fails to demonstrate compliance with Policy T1 in respect of both the amount of parking and, on current evidence, aspects of its design and usability.

Although the overall site layout has improved it appears that the internal layouts have not progressed sufficiently to address concerns over dwelling quality, that there is concern density has been prioritised over livability, and that further changes are required including removal or amendment of certain one-bed one-person units, internal habitable rooms without windows and north-facing single-aspect dwellings.

The Council additionally remains concerned that the proposal has not satisfactorily resolved issues relating to the quality and liveability of parts of the residential accommodation.

The revised scheme is acknowledged to be an improvement on the original proposal. However, the amended submission does not overcome the principal planning objections. The proposal remains substantial unallocated development in the Metropolitan Green Belt, in an isolated and car-dependent location, with continuing conflict with parking policy and continuing concerns regarding residential quality.

The proposal would still amount to substantial unallocated development in the Metropolitan Green Belt. It would still harm openness and weaken settlement separation. It would still place a significant residential development in an isolated and car-dependent location. Most importantly, the residential parking provision now appears to fall materially and substantially below the minimum standard applicable to a moderate-connectivity site under the Essex Parking Guidance 2024, with a shortfall of about 250 spaces and a clear mismatch between the standard and the allocation proposed for one-, two- and three-bedroom dwellings. That is a serious conflict, not a minor shortfall.

Accordingly, the revisions do not overcome the grounds for objection.

For all of those reasons, Chigwell Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to the application and requests that Epping Forest District Council refuse planning permission.

In the event that Epping Forest District Council is nevertheless minded to approve the application, Chigwell Parish Council requests that its objections be reported in full to the determining committee and that a Parish Council representative be permitted to address that committee.

7. **PL284/25 - [EPF/0343/26](#) - 16, The Shrubberies, Chigwell, IG7 5DU**

Single storey rear extension and raised terrace/patio.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

8. PL285/25 - [EPF/0484/26](#) - 13, Brook Parade, Chigwell, IG7 6PF

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

Members **NOTED** the Officer report ([Appendix 3](#))

Chigwell Parish Council

Members **STRONGLY OBJECT** to application EPF/0484/26 and recommend that Epping Forest District Council refuse planning permission. The Council considers that the application is not a minor or technical amendment to the appeal-approved scheme under EPF/2701/19, but a substantive attempt to alter the height, bulk, massing and visual presence of the rooftop extension that was approved only because of its very specific design characteristics. The proposed variation of Condition 2 would substitute the appeal-approved drawings with a plan package that appears materially to alter the scale, height, bulk, massing and visual profile of the approved rooftop extension. In doing so, it would move away from the specific scheme found acceptable by the Planning Inspector under appeal reference APP/J1535/W/22/3293716, whose decision relied on the descending roofline, front set-back, alignment, subdued material treatment and overall balanced proportions of the approved design. The amended development would appear more dominant, top-heavy and incongruous in the street scene and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of Brook Parade. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies SP2 and DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011–2033 and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The application also fails to provide a sufficiently clear, accurate and transparent basis for assessment of the amended development. In particular, the planning history demonstrates previous uncertainty and inadequate information in relation to the upper-level form, balcony or railing treatment, and the distinction between conditions dealing with approved plans, materials and privacy screens. The Council cannot therefore be satisfied that the amended proposal represents a coherent, properly explained and policy-compliant revision to the appeal-approved scheme. The proposal is accordingly contrary to Policies SP2 and DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011–2033 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

In the event that Epping Forest District Council is nevertheless minded to approve the application, Chigwell Parish Council requests that its objections be reported in full to the determining committee and that a Parish Council representative be permitted to address that committee.

9. PL286/25 - [EPF/0471/26](#) - 177, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6NX

Advertisement consent for four fascia and one projecting sign.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

10. PL287/25 - [EPF/0462/26](#) - 3, Barton Close, Chigwell, IG7 6LJ

Proposed single storey rear extension with 4 No. roof lights.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

6.54pm - Cllr Rizvi joined the meeting

11. PL288/25 - [EPF/0477/26](#) - 1, Hill Top View, Chigwell, IG8 8BG

Construction of a single-storey detached rear outbuilding to provide a residential annexe.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection however, in the event that Epping Forest District Council is minded to approve the application, Chigwell Parish Council requests that any permission includes a condition that the ancillary unit cannot be sold, rented, accessed or otherwise used separately from the main house.

6.58pm - Cllr Ali joined the meeting

7.00pm - Cllr Skingsley joined the meeting

12. PL289/25 - [EPF/0497/26](#) - 56, Lechmere Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5ET

Garage conversion to habitable space.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

13. PL290/25 - [EPF/0501/26](#) - Kenswal, Grove Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6JD

Erection of an outbuilding in the rear garden.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

7.02pm - Cllr Hodds joined the meeting

14. PL291/25 - [EPF/0522/26](#) - 30, Courtland Drive, Chigwell, IG7 6PW

Proposed double storey front extension, conversion of garage, new front steps, new fenestration to the front elevation, first floor side extension, part first floor rear extension, ground floor rear extension, raising of the roof to facilitate a loft conversion with associated rear dormers and front rooflights.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection in principle but the Parish Council were disappointed that the submitted plans did not adequately demonstrate that the proposal would sit comfortably within the street scene and were therefore unable to consider this aspect of the application. As such they ask the LPA to confirm that the development is sympathetic to local character and contributes positively to the quality of the area

15. PL292/25 - [EPF/0468/26](#) - 12, Emmaus Way, Chigwell, IG7 5BY

TPO/EPF/11/11 (Ref: T14)

T1: Oak - Crown reduction removing up to 2.5m laterally and up to 1m apically, as specified.

The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate treatment or felling of a protected tree. The Council, therefore, **OBJECTS** to this application. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection

LICENSING APPLICATIONS

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, on the following application

16. PL293/25 - New Premises Licence Application - TescoExpress, 177 High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6NU

Includes application for the provision of late night refreshment and sale of alcohol for consumption off the premises up to 06:00 to 00:00 for 7 days a week

Chigwell Parish Council:

The Council **OBJECTS** to the application for a premises licence at Tesco Express, 177 High Road, Chigwell, insofar as it seeks opening from 6:00 and off-sales of alcohol until 00:00 daily.

The principal objection relates to the prevention of public nuisance. In a largely residential village location, opposite a children's playground and close to existing homes, the extension of opening and alcohol sales from 6.00am until midnight creates a clear risk of disturbance beyond what residents should reasonably be expected to tolerate. That disturbance is likely to arise not simply from the operation of the store itself, but from customer activity associated with it, including vehicle arrivals and departures, car doors, engines, voices, congregation outside the premises, littering and the wider consequences of late-evening off-sales of alcohol.

The relationship of the store to Station Green Playground is especially important. During the day, the playground is plainly a family-focused amenity. During the evening, however, its open setting and prominence mean that it is capable of becoming a focal point for loitering or congregation. A premises selling alcohol until midnight immediately opposite that location materially increases the risk that the area will attract or retain late-night activity to the detriment of residents.

The Parish Council has already to manage significant litter from existing outlets and has also received reports of anti-social behaviour in this locality late at night. That local evidence is significant. It means that the committee is not considering a purely theoretical risk. Rather, there is already a pattern of concern regarding night time littering and late-night behaviour in the vicinity, and the view is that a further off-licence operating until midnight would be likely to aggravate that problem.

There are also substantial concerns in relation to the prevention of crime and disorder. The application proposes a late-night off-sales operation in a location already associated, from the Parish Council's perspective, with reports of anti-social behaviour. In those circumstances, generic

measures such as CCTV and staff training do not, by themselves, amount to a persuasive site-specific response.

Of particular concern is the absence of stronger location-specific controls that might address the risks arising from late-night alcohol sales opposite a playground and close to homes. There appears to be no tailored restriction on alcohol sales hours as distinct from store opening hours, no clear dispersal strategy, and no evident package of enhanced controls directed specifically to congregation and nuisance outside the premises. In officer view, the proposed measures do not sufficiently demonstrate that the licensing objective of preventing crime and disorder will be promoted if the premises is permitted to trade and sell alcohol until midnight.

Although the application includes a Think 25 policy, that addresses under-age sales and is only one aspect of the wider licensing objective of protecting children from harm. In this case the broader context is especially important. The store is directly opposite a children's playground, and the concern is therefore not confined to unlawful sales to minors. It extends to children and families being exposed to the consequences of late-night alcohol-related activity, including nuisance, foul language, litter, broken glass and a general deterioration in the amenity and sense of safety of the area.

The proximity of the site to the playground therefore adds considerable weight to the objection. In officer view, a midnight off-licence in this position is plainly capable of undermining the objective of protecting children from harm.

Summary

The issue considered by the Parish Council was not whether a convenience store is acceptable in principle at this location. The issue was whether opening and alcohol sales until midnight are appropriate in this particular setting. The Council's view is that they are not.

The Council considered that the application, as submitted, would undermine the licensing objectives of preventing public nuisance, preventing crime and disorder, and protecting children from harm. This is not an urban town-centre location. EFDC's own evidence identifies Chigwell as a Large Village and describes it as operating more as a large village than a town. The area is predominantly residential in character, with shopping mainly centred on Brook Parade.

The location of the premises is particularly sensitive. The store is directly opposite Station Green Playground and immediately close to residential property. In the Council's view, permitting alcohol sales and customer activity until midnight at this location would create an unacceptable risk of late-night congregation, noise, disturbance, littering and alcohol-related nuisance. The proximity to a children's playground materially increases those concerns.

The Parish Council has also received reports of anti-social behaviour in this area late at night. The Council therefore asks the Licensing Committee to treat the risk as a real and existing local concern rather than a speculative one. In the Council's view, a further alcohol outlet operating until midnight is likely to add to existing problems.

The Council also notes that existing convenience stores in the area operate materially earlier hours. MACE at Brook Parade closes at 9.00pm, and Morrisons Daily at Brook Parade closes at 8.00pm. The Council understands that nearby convenience stores in comparable village and residential locations also commonly open at 7.00am and close at 10.00pm or 11.00pm rather than midnight. In that context, the proposed 06:00 to 00:00 terminal hour is excessive and out of keeping with the character of the locality.

For these reasons, Chigwell Parish Council respectfully requests that the Licensing Committee refuse the application as submitted. If Members are nevertheless minded to grant a licence, the Parish Council requests that weekday opening is after 7.00 and 8:00 at weekends and the terminal hour for opening and alcohol sales be reduced to no later than 10.00pm daily and that robust additional conditions be imposed to address the risks of nuisance, anti-social behaviour and harm to children

In the event that Epping Forest District Council is nevertheless minded to approve the application, Chigwell Parish Council requests that its objections be reported in full to the determining committee and that a Parish Council representative be permitted to address that committee.

7.09pm #Cllr Clarke joined the meeting

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

17. PL294/25 - None

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

18. PL295/25 - 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)

19. PL296/25 - [EPF/0420/26](#) - Wells Park School, School Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6NN

Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed single storey building, refurbishment of the eastern wing of the existing school building and alterations to the play area.

20. PL297/25 - [EPF/0481/26](#) - 4, Chigwell Park Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5BD

Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed change of roof profile for loft conversion.

21. PL298/25 - [EPF/0507/26](#) - 56, Lechmere Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5ET

Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed loft conversion with rear dormer and single storey rear extension.

22. PL299/25 - [EPF/0510/26](#) - 24, The Orangery, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6DL

Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed solar panels to main roof.

APPEALS

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

23. PL300/25 - NONE

**24. PL301/25 - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A DECISION TO BE MADE OR
ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE NEXT MEETING**

25. PL302/25 - DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Thursday 16 April at 6.30pm

The meeting closed at 7.11pm