## **EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List**

Application Details & Constraints												
Case Ref:	se Ref: EPF/0719/25			PL No: 016279								
Site Address:		56, Coolgardie Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5AY										
Proposal:		Proposed two-storey side extension with garage conversion, single-storey rear extension, replacement of external windows and doors, front landscaping with driveway alterations, material upgrade to the existing rear dormer, and installation of rooflights to side roof planes.										
Green Belt		Yes □	No ⊠	TPO		Yes □	No ⊠					
Conservation Area		Yes □ No ⊠		Herita	ge Asset (Listed)	Yes □	No ⊠					
Flood Zone		Yes □	No ⊠	Enforcement		Yes □	No ⊠					
Representations												
Town/Parish Council Comments, if any: Chigwell Parish Council comments: 'No objection although the Council noted with disappointment the lack of a street scene.'												
Objection		No Object	ion 🗵	Comm	ent 🗵	None Recei	ved 🗆					
Neighbour Responses, if any:			<ul> <li>2 comments received from adjacent neighbours. 1 in support and the other objecting to the proposal. This is summarised as:</li> <li>Terracing effect.</li> <li>Does not support any increase in height to boundary wall between no.56 and no.58.</li> <li>Loss of light to habitable room.</li> <li>Inaccurate plans with dwellings numbered incorrectly throughout.</li> </ul>									
EFDC Environmental Protection and Land Drainage			No objection and no conditions to request.									

## **Planning Considerations**

## **EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List**

Highway Safety/Parking Loss of garage is not o safety.  Acceptable Trees and Landscaping:  Acceptable Comments on Represe Additional Notes:	considered:	Unacceptable	mpact existing p	N/A arking ar N/A	rangements or hi	ghway						
Highway Safety/Parking Loss of garage is not o safety.  Acceptable Trees and Landscaping:  Acceptable Comments on Represe	considered:	Unacceptable	mpact existing p	arking ar	rangements or hi	ghway						
Highway Safety/Parking Loss of garage is not o safety. Acceptable Trees and Landscaping	considered	Unacceptable	mpact existing p	arking ar	rangements or hi	ghway						
Highway Safety/Parking Loss of garage is not o safety. Acceptable	considered	- '	mpact existing p	arking ar	rangements or hi	ghway						
Highway Safety/Parking Loss of garage is not o safety.	considered	- '	mpact existing p	arking ar	rangements or hi	ghway						
Highway Safety/Parkinį Loss of garage is not o	•	d to negatively in			rangements or hi							
		·		N/A		X						
Acceptable		Unacceptable										
Green Belt:												
Acceptable		Unacceptable	$\boxtimes$	N/A								
Neighbouring Amenitie Ground levels differ du The proposed plans do to demonstrate the de proposed side extensic loss of light to a habita	ue to an in not conta evelopmer on clearly v	ncline in the road ain a markup of th nt will not result would not meet t	he BRE 45-degre in loss of light t	2m heigh e rule. A o habita	s such, the propos ble rooms at no.5	al fails 8. The						
Acceptable		Unacceptable	X	N/A								
Overall, the proposal i		red harmful to t	he established o	character	and appearance	of the						
The proposed rear elevation offers some coherence in design in comparison to the existing however, the height, width and proximity of the proposed rear extension together with the significant ground level difference with its neighbour to the west results in an overbearing form.												
The main issue for consideration is design. The proposed side extension appears incongruous above the garage with eaves height extending above the existing eaves. Building to the boundary with no.58 the proposed development infills the existing visual gap between no.58 and loses its detachment. The proposed front elevation results in a pronounced form of development and together with its elevated position, dominates the streetscene. The proposed side extension results in a terracing effect and is not supported.												
	pre-app a	advice PRE/0296/	23 for a smaller	scheme.								
The application follows				ast resu	_							
imilar age using a mi evels.	_			-	ietached dweiling							
above the garage with eaves height extending above the existing eaves. Building to the boundary with no.58 the proposed development infills the existing visual gap between no.58 and loses its detachment. The proposed front elevation results in a pronounced form of development and cogether with its elevated position, dominates the streetscene. The proposed side extension results in a terracing effect and is not supported.  The proposed rear elevation offers some coherence in design in comparison to the existing nowever, the height, width and proximity of the proposed rear extension together with the												

## **EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List**