

PLANNING COMMITTEE OFFICER REPORT

Application Ref: EPF/0330/26

Site: 13, Brook Parade, Chigwell, IG7 6PF

Proposal: Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 8 (Construction Method Statement) of planning permission EPF/2701/19 allowed on appeal for the construction of an additional storey comprising 6 no. two-bedroom flats.

Recommendation

Although the revised Construction Method Statement is more detailed than the previous submission, it still does not provide the precise, fixed and site-specific details required by the condition and it remains insufficiently clear for effective monitoring and enforcement.

Site and Proposal

The application relates to an occupied mixed-use parade at Brook Parade, with shops at ground floor and flats above, together with rear servicing/access. The approved development is the construction of an additional storey to provide 6 two-bedroom flats. The site is sensitive because it is occupied, constrained and has an active public interface to both the front and rear.

Relevant Planning History

Planning permission EPF/2701/19 was refused by EFDC and later allowed on appeal on 2 October 2023, subject to conditions. This application seeks discharge of Condition 8.

A previous discharge application, EPF/1679/25, was not supported. The earlier officer report recorded that Essex County Council Highways could not support discharge because no Traffic Management Plan had been submitted showing matters such as wheel washing locations, parking, material storage areas and fencing positions. The previous officer conclusion was that Condition 8 could not be discharged.

The Relevant Condition

Condition 8 requires that no development shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CMS must include precise details of:

- i. parking for site operatives and visitors;
- ii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- iii. storage areas for plant and materials;
- iv. erection and maintenance of security hoardings;
- v. measures to control dust, dirt and detritus from vehicles; and
- vi. recycling/disposal of demolition and construction waste.

Once approved, the development must be carried out in full accordance with the approved CMS.

Previous Parish Council Comments

Chigwell Parish Council previously objected on the basis that the earlier CMS was generic, inaccurate and not site specific. The Parish Council noted that the homes and shops would remain

occupied during the build and scaled plans showing access, hoarding, gates and pedestrian routes were missing. There was no delivery and routing strategy reflecting Brook Mews constraints, no workforce travel plan and no dust, noise and vibration controls or a materials and waste plan, scaffold and lighting detail, no fire strategy for a partially occupied building and named liaison contacts as well as containing factual errors.

Summary of the Revised Submission

The revised CMS dated 14 February 2026 is fuller than the August 2025 version. It now includes sections on key contacts, emergency procedures, pedestrian management, environmental controls, housekeeping, work at height, scaffolding, lifting operations, incident reporting, fire precautions and first aid. It also recognises that the building remains occupied, states that deliveries and collections will be routed via Brook Mews to the rear of Unit 23 and says public access to the commercial units will be maintained.

These are improvements. However, the central issue is whether the submission now contains the precise details required by Condition 8. In the officer's view, it does not.

Officer Assessment

General

The revised CMS is better than the previous version, but it still relies too heavily on general statements and management intentions rather than fixed, measurable and plan-based arrangements capable of approval and enforcement.

Parking Arrangements

The CMS states that parking for the site team and visitors will be within the site, apart from space for a vehicle to the rear, and also states that roads around Brook Mews have spare daytime capacity, with subcontractors encouraged to use public transport or share vehicles. However, it does not identify the number of spaces, their exact location, or how contractor overspill parking will be prevented. That is not the level of precision required.

Loading, Unloading and Traffic Management

The CMS states that deliveries and collections will be routed via Brook Mews, that larger deliveries will be timed, and that a banksman or traffic marshal will manage vehicle movements. However, it also states that a Traffic Management Plan will be displayed in the site office and that this plan will detail wheel wash locations, ingress and egress points, fencing, welfare, storage areas, parking, emergency assembly points, pedestrian routes and footprint boundaries.

That is a key problem. The principal operational plan has still not been submitted as part of this discharge application. The same omission was central to the earlier refusal to discharge Condition 8.

Storage Areas

The revised CMS refers generally to limited rear space, agreed secure locations and the rear of Unit 23 as the main waste collection point. However, no scaled layout has been submitted showing the precise location of plant, materials, skips, wheel wash equipment, welfare facilities, compounds or exclusion zones. On a constrained and occupied site, this remains a significant omission.

Hoardings, Gates and Pedestrian Routes

The revised CMS refers to site hoarding, segregated pedestrian and vehicle gates, lighting and signage, and states that public access to the commercial units will be maintained. However, there is still no scaled drawing showing the hoarding line, gate positions, protected pedestrian routes, maintained access to shopfronts and flats, or any protective measures needed where the works interface directly with the public realm. Those details should be fixed at discharge stage.

Dust, Dirt, Highway Cleanliness and Waste

The revised CMS includes provisions on wheel washing, highway cleaning, dust suppression, waste segregation, recycling, licensed carriers and housekeeping. These are improvements. However, they remain general management commitments rather than precise approved details. The locations of wheel wash facilities, skips and waste holding areas are not shown on a plan, and the submission does not demonstrate a clear site-specific collection arrangement that avoids conflict with occupiers and pedestrians.

Fire, Emergency and Occupied-Building Management

The revised CMS includes more material on fire precautions, work at height, scaffolding and lifting operations, which is a positive change. It also recognises that the parade remains occupied and that access routes and emergency escape must be maintained.

However, the document remains inconsistent. The emergency assembly point is left as "TBC" in one part, while other sections refer to arrangements that will be put in place or displayed later. The document also refers to "vacant possession of the site," which sits uneasily with its repeated acknowledgement that the shops and flats remain occupied. These inconsistencies weaken confidence in the submission as a final and reliable CMS.

Community Liaison and Site Contacts

The revised CMS contains a key contacts section and a general good neighbour policy, but many contact details remain "TBC", including important project and management contacts. On a sensitive occupied site, these gaps are not minor and further reduce the document's effectiveness as an approved control document.

Accuracy and Internal Consistency

Although some earlier errors have been corrected, concerns remain. The revised CMS still describes the site in generalised terms and still refers to some out-of-hours work being expected. Overall, it still reads in part as a generic working document rather than a tightly prepared, site-specific discharge submission.

Commencement of Works

A further important consideration is that works have already commenced on site. Condition 8 expressly requires approval of the CMS before development takes place. The fact that development has started makes the absence of a satisfactory, precise and enforceable approved CMS more serious, not less serious.

The Parish Council has also been provided with further background information raising concerns about the practical management of active roof-level works, debris, pedestrian interface and access

around this occupied parade. Without seeking to determine separate health and safety liability through this planning response, that background underlines the importance of ensuring that any CMS approved under Condition 8 contains clear, site-specific and enforceable details for hoarding, exclusion zones, lifting operations, pedestrian protection, access management and monitoring.

Monitoring and Enforceability

This is the core planning issue. Condition 8 can only work if the approved document is sufficiently exact that compliance can be checked on site. Here, too many essential matters are still left to later management, later display, later briefing or later updating. The submission therefore does not provide a robust or enforceable basis for discharge on a live, occupied and publicly exposed site.

Conclusion

The revised CMS is materially better than the August 2025 version. It now acknowledges the occupied nature of the parade, proposes rear servicing via Brook Mews, and contains fuller text on pedestrian management, environmental controls, scaffolding, lifting operations, housekeeping and waste handling.

However, it still does not provide the precise, fixed and plan-based details required by Condition 8. In particular, there is still no submitted Traffic Management Plan or detailed site logistics drawing showing wheel wash locations, ingress and egress, fencing and hoarding positions, storage areas, visitor and contractor parking, emergency assembly points, segregated pedestrian routes and site boundaries, despite the CMS itself saying that such a plan will exist and will contain those details.

That lack of precision is compounded by internal inconsistencies, incomplete "TBC" information, and the fact that works have already commenced before approval of the condition. The current submission therefore remains insufficiently site-specific and insufficiently enforceable to justify discharge.

Recommended Parish Council Response

Chigwell Parish Council objects to the discharge of Condition 8

While the revised CMS is an improvement on the previous submission, it remains insufficiently precise, insufficiently site-specific and insufficiently enforceable to satisfy the requirements of the condition. The application should not be approved unless and until a fully detailed and annotated site logistics / traffic management package is submitted showing:

- operative and visitor parking arrangements
- delivery, loading and unloading arrangements
- plant, material and waste storage locations
- hoarding lines, gates and fencing positions
- segregated pedestrian routes and any necessary protective measures
- lifting exclusion zones and maintained occupier access
- resolved emergency and contact arrangements throughout the construction period