

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Application Details & Constraints					
Case Ref:	EPF/1338/24	PL No:	014508		
Site Address:	2, Green Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6LY				
Proposal:	Outbuilding.				
Green Belt	Yes ☒	No ☐	TPO	Yes ☐	No ☒
Conservation Area	Yes ☐	No ☒	Heritage Asset (Listed)	Yes ☐	No ☒
Flood Zone	Yes ☐	No ☒	Enforcement	Yes ☐	No ☒
Representations					
Town/Parish Council Comments, if any: The Parish Council objects to the application due to concerns about potential inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, they indicate a willingness to waive the objection if relevant officers deem the application acceptable, with or without amendments.					
Objection ☒	No Objection ☐	Comment ☐	None Received ☐		
Neighbour Responses, if any:		A neighbour objects to the proposed outbuilding at 2 Green Lane, arguing that it is located on agricultural land, not within the residential curtilage. They reference previous planning applications and conditions intended to restrict additional development to protect the openness of the Green Belt. They also state that the proposal relies heavily on their hedge for screening; however, as the hedge is seasonal and pruned to a height of 6 feet, the outbuilding would remain visible particularly during winter and from the nearby public bridleway. They believe the application misrepresents the outbuilding's visibility and express concern that approval could set a precedent for similar developments on nearby agricultural land.			
Planning Considerations					
Character and Appearance: The application site is situated within the Metropolitan Green Belt and consists of a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling located at the end of Green Lane in Chigwell. The adjoining property shares a similar design and style. Green Lane contains a total of three dwellings, all positioned in a tranquil setting in Chigwell. The site is surrounded by open fields, which contribute to the rural and spacious character. To the front of the property is a bridleway. Permitted Development rights were removed for any extensions or alterations under planning approval EPF/0635/91. The proposal is for an outbuilding at the rear of the curtilage of 2 Green Lane, approximately 3m at its closest point to the boundary line. It will measure 4.88m in width, 3m in depth and 2.44m in height. A door entrance is proposed on the outbuilding's SW elevation, with four windows featuring on its NW elevation all measuring 0.7m x 0.78m. The proposal will feature a pitched roof with a felt roof covering and close boarded timber walls. In isolation, the design is deemed acceptable.					
Acceptable ☒	Unacceptable ☐	N/A ☐			

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Neighbouring Amenities:

In accordance with the Epping Forest District Council Local Plan and the NPPF, the proposed outbuilding is not anticipated to harm neighbouring amenity. No impacts on privacy, overlooking, or overshadowing are expected.

Acceptable	☒	Unacceptable	☐	N/A	☐
------------	-------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Green Belt:

In 1989, planning permission was initially granted on appeal under reference EPF/1230/89 for a two-storey side/rear extension and garage. During the implementation of these works, the property suffered a major structural failure, leading to a subsequent application in 1991 (EPF/0635/91) to restore the property to the same form and appearance. Although the development was contrary to Green Belt policies at the time, it was deemed appropriate to grant approval under the exceptional circumstances. A condition was attached to the 1991 approval, removing permitted development rights to safeguard against any further impact on the Green Belt. The approved extensions ultimately increased the property's volume by approximately 57% over its original size. The application site has faced a number of refusals on Green Belt grounds, however, applications EPF/0960/08, EPF/0766/14 and EPF/0080/22 have been approved as they were deemed to have a neutral impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

In 2020, a pre-application enquiry (EF\2020\ENQ\01140) for a proposed outbuilding in the rear garden was advised against by the Council. The proposed structure, at approximately 3m by 5m with a height of 2.5m, was deemed likely to compromise the openness of the Green Belt and, thus, unsupported.

The current proposal, with dimensions of 4.88m in width, 3m in depth and 2.44m in height, closely mirrors the scale and location of the previous enquiry. Although this layout differs slightly in orientation and scale, it remains positioned similarly within the site. The submitted supporting documents and images also highlight that trees and hedges may provide some screening which will reduce the visibility of the outbuilding. However, natural screening is variable, particularly during colder months and cannot be relied upon as a permanent mitigation measure to provide sufficient screening. It is also noted that the application site's prominent position and visibility from the public paths and open fields increases the outbuilding's impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Paragraph 152 of the NPPF highlights that any development deemed "inappropriate" is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and should only be permitted in very special circumstances. Paragraph 153 stipulates that "substantial weight" must be given to any harm to the Green Belt. In this case, although the proposed outbuilding alone might be considered an acceptable addition, the cumulative effect of the existing substantial additions creates a compounded impact, that compromises the openness of the Green Belt.

The proposal, when considered alongside the substantial additions to the property, would result in cumulative harm to the Green Belt by impacting its openness. Given the considerable weight afforded to protecting the Green Belt's integrity as stipulated by both national and local policy, the application does not meet the criteria for an exception and would conflict with policies designed to restrict inappropriate development. As such, the proposal is deemed unacceptable.

Acceptable	☐	Unacceptable	☒	N/A	☐
------------	--------------------------	--------------	-------------------------------------	-----	--------------------------

Highway Safety/Parking:

Acceptable	☐	Unacceptable	☐	N/A	☒
------------	--------------------------	--------------	--------------------------	-----	-------------------------------------

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Trees and Landscaping:			
Acceptable ☐	Unacceptable ☐	N/A ☒	
Comments on Representations, if any: Representations have been duly noted. Aerial imagery indicates that the area in question has functioned as part of the residential garden for over 25 years. Its longstanding use appears consistent with residential curtilage.			
Additional Notes:			
Drawings/Plans: 20713 and 20713(01)			
Officer Recommendation:	Approve ☐	Refuse ☒	