

EFDC Planning Application Check List for Householders & other small-scale applications

Case Ref:	EPF/0676/21	PL No:	031119
Address:	Oakwood 203 High Road Chigwell IG7 5BJ		
Description of works:	Proposed single storey & two storey side & rear extension, front porch, conversion of a garage into a habitable room, rear conservatory & enlargement of a rear dormer.		

Application Check		
Site Notice:	Yes Not required	☐ ☒
Site Visit:	Yes No No access	☐ ☒ ☐
Photos/Images available:	Yes No	☐ ☒

Consultation responses		
Town/Parish Council	Object No objection No comment None received	☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
Comments: OBJECTION – because the proposed elevations and conversion would result in an excessively bulky structure and is considered an overdevelopment of the site in relation to the existing setting.		
No neighbour responses	None received	

Constraints		
Green Belt:	Yes No	☐ ☒
Conservation:	Yes No	☐ ☒
Listed Building:	Yes No	☐ ☒
TPO:	Yes No	☒ ☐
Enforcement:	Yes No	☐ ☒
Other:		

EFDC Planning Application Check List for Householders & other small-scale applications

Planning Considerations			Comments:
Character and appearance:	Acceptable ☒ Unacceptable ☐ N/A ☐		
Neighbouring amenities:	Acceptable ☒ Unacceptable ☐ N/A ☐		
Green Belt:	Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable ☐ N/A ☒		
Highways safety/Parking/Access:	Acceptable ☒ Unacceptable ☐ N/A ☐		
Trees and Landscaping:	Acceptable ☐ Unacceptable ☒ N/A ☐		There is a large tree on the development site which has a Tree Preservation Order on it. This tree has the potential to be adversely impacted by the development proposals. Tree reports are required to demonstrate that no such harm will come to this legally protected tree, however no such report has been submitted. The proposal therefore fails to demonstrate that this tree will be retained, which is a requirement of Policy LL10 of the Adopted Local Plan and with Policy DM 5 of the emerging Local Plan. It is not acceptable to deal with the issue through the use of planning conditions since the findings of tree reports after permission has been granted are unable to influence the design of the proposed development. This policy conflict weighs heavily against the proposal.
Representations considered:	Yes ☒ N/A ☐		
Notes:			

Recommendation: Approve ☐ Refuse ☒
--