EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Application Details & Constraints					
Case Ref:	EPF/1010/25		PL No:	32504	
Site Address:	43, Meadow Way, Chigwell, IG7 6LR				
Proposal:	Erection of two storey rear extension and single storey side extension, new front porch and new front boundary wall with additional entrance.				
Green Belt	Yes ☐	No ☒	TPO (Veteran Trees)	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 Council OBJECTS on the grounds it considers the proposals in terms of the form and design of the roof would appear as a discordant feature which would fail to respect the host dwelling and fail to positively relate to its context*			
Objection ☒	No Objection ☐	Comment ☐	None Received ☐

41 Meadow Way	OBJECTION – summarised as: • Loss in house value as it would become semi-detached
45 Meadow Way	OBJECTION – summarised as: • Overlooking and Loss of Privacy • Overbearing Impact • Loss of Light and Overshadowing • Impact on Residential Amenity
The Willows, Vicarage Lane	OBJECTION - summarised as: • Overlooking and Loss of Privacy • Overbearing Impact • Loss of Light and Overshadowing • Impact on Residential Amenity
EFDC Land Drainage	No objection subject to condition.

Relevant Planning History
None.

Planning Considerations

22 July 2025

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Principle of Development:
The application site comprises a detached bungalow consisting of a ground floor and habitable roof space. The proposed two storey rear extension would convert this chalet bungalow to a two-storey dwelling which is unacceptable in principle.
Policy H1 of the EFDC Local Plan dictates that the needs of those with accessibility requirements, including older people, can be supported by bungalow accommodation. Information contained in the Council's Authority Monitoring Reports show that there has been a gradual erosion of the district's existing stock of bungalows. The Council considers that bungalows can play an important role because of their potential ease of adaptation such that they can provide choice for people with accessibility requirements, including the current and future needs of older people.
It is also noted that the retention of bungalows is not simply about ensuring a supply of accessible homes, but also a mix of different size and types of dwellings.
The principle of the development is therefore contrary to Policy H1 E of the EFDC Local Plan 2011-2033 (2023) and unacceptable.

Acceptable	☐	Unacceptable	☒	N/A	☐

Character and Appearance:
Policy DM9 of the EFDC Local Plan dictates that all new development must achieve a high quality of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Development proposals for extensions will be required to respect and/or complement the form, setting, period, and detailing of the original buildings.
The proposal neither respects nor complements the original building or wider area. The proposed front porch appears at odds with the front elevation, with its roof form and rooflight appearing ill-matched with the existing character of the house. The rear two storey extension also appears at odds with the original dwelling due to its discordant roof form and the substantial increase in mass and built form protruding rearwards. The development is therefore contrary to Policy DM9 and is unacceptable.

Acceptable	☐	Unacceptable	☒	N/A	☐

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Neighbouring Amenities:
Policy DM9 of the EFDC Local Plan dictates that development proposals must take account of the privacy and amenity of the development's occupiers and neighbours and integrate occupier comfort and wellbeing within the design and layout. Objections have been received from Nos.41 and 43 Meadow Way and The Willows on Vicarage Lane.

<u>No.41 Meadow Way</u>
The occupant(s) objection relates to loss in house value which is not a material planning consideration. Given the application dwelling's positioning and the proposed siting of the extensions adjacent to No.41, the proposed extensions would not significantly protrude further rearwards at ground floor level and the two-storey element would be sited a sufficient distance from No.41 so as not to create a detrimental loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing or be an over-bearing and overly enclosed form of development.

<u>No.45 Meadow Way</u>
The occupant(s) of this property have objected due to overlooking/loss of privacy; overbearing impact; loss of light/overshadowing and impact on private amenity.
Whilst the number of windows on the eastern elevation would be increased, they would not directly face this dwelling and the separation distance between these windows and the rear windows at No.45 (some 35m) is considered sufficient to prevent overlooking and ensure a degree of privacy between properties.
Whilst the application dwelling's bulk and mass would significantly increase as it extends to the rear, sufficient separation distance exists between the properties which prevents a detrimental loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing or an over-bearing and overly enclosed form of development particularly given the siting of the extension which is further back/no adjacent to the boundary with No.45.

<u>The Willows, Vicarage Lane</u>
The occupant(s) of this property have objected due to overlooking/loss of privacy; overbearing impact; loss of light/overshadowing and impact on private amenity.
Whilst three new first floor windows serving habitable rooms would be sited on the eastern elevation, some 35m of garden space would separate the two properties; this level of distance is considered sufficient to prevent overlooking and ensure a degree of privacy between properties particularly given the presence of trees along the boundary and the application dwelling is sited on lower ground due to the sloping nature of Meadow Way. Whilst the application dwelling's bulk and mass would significantly increase as it extends to the rear, sufficient separation distance exists between the properties which prevents a detrimental loss of daylight/sunlight, overshadowing or an over-bearing and overly enclosed form of development.

Acceptable	☒	Unacceptable	☐	N/A	☐

Highway Safety/Parking:
Highway and parking arrangements would remain as existing.

Acceptable	☒	Unacceptable	☐	N/A	☐

Comments on Representations, if any:
Addressed within report.

Additional Notes:
For the reasons set out above, the application is recommended for refusal.

Officer Recommendation:		**Approve**	☐	**Refuse**	☒

22 July 2025

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

22 July 2025