

Delegated Report

EPF/1359/17

Description of Site:

The application relates to a two storey detached house on the south side of Chigwell Rise. The property has been substantially altered following a 2015 permission with works to the roof including dormers and a crown roof, although a ground floor rear extension approved as part of the scheme has not been implemented.

The property lies in an area of individually styled detached properties, mostly two storeys in original form, with extensive additions including into the roof. The site lies directly opposite an amenity green at Lea Grove.

Land falls to the south and east, the buildings are elevated above the rear gardens by in excess of 1 metre

Description of Proposal:

The application proposes a 6m deep ground floor rear extension and a 3m deep first floor rear extension. These lie across the full width of the building, retaining existing pedestrian sideways. Hipped pitched roof has low pitch in order to retain outlook from dormer windows above, matching materials are indicated.

Relevant History:

EPF/2906/15 Single storey rear extension and re-profile existing roof to form a Dutch hip end, dormers to the rear and bonnet dormers to the front to accommodate 3 bedrooms in the loft void, conversion of existing garage into a habitable room and new raised patio at rear – approved at Area Committee following Parish Council objection

EPF/1749/16 Proposed infill dormer between rear dormers of previously approved loft extension – refused March 17 on cumulative bulk of extensions.

Policies Applied:

Adopted Local Plan:

CP2	Protecting the quality of the rural and built environment
DBE9	Loss of Amenity
DBE10	Design of Residential Extensions

NPPF:

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been adopted as national policy since March 2012. Paragraph 215 states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework. The above policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

Draft Local Plan:

At the current time, only limited weight can be applied to the Draft Local Plan, however the Draft Plan and evidence base should be considered as a material consideration in planning decisions. The relevant policies in this case are as follows:

DM9 High Quality Design
DM10 Housing design and quality

Consultation Carried Out and Summary of Representations Received:

Date of site visit: 26 June 2017
Number of neighbours consulted: Five
Site notice posted: No, not required
Responses received: No response received from neighbours.
Parish Council: Chigwell PC had no objection subject to impact from the bulk on neighbours being carefully considered

Main Issues and Considerations:

The 2015 application included a 3m deep first floor extension set in from both side walls of the 3m ground floor extension below by 1.5m which was deleted after concerns were raised at the impact on neighbours.

Since then, permission has been granted for extensions at no 20 (currently under construction) which includes a 6m deep ground floor and first floor at 4m deep. It is noted that both adjoining properties (18 and 22) project beyond the original rear wall of no 20. In terms of the current proposal, this will not significantly affect the neighbours at the newly extended neighbour.

The same cannot be said for number 16 which is recessed and has a conservatory squaring off the rear of the house indicated on the block plan. The proposed two storey extension will project around 5m beyond the rear most wall, and the ground floor by around 8 metres. Despite the setting in from the boundary, the impact on the neighbours would clearly be intrusive and unacceptable, appearing excessively overbearing to the detriment of outlook from both the garden and rear elevation of 16 Chigwell Rise.

Conclusion:

The extension has a significant impact on the neighbours at no.16 in terms of the overall mass and bulk and the application should be refused on this basis.

No way forward is being suggested as the first floor extension in particular appears unacceptable in principle.