

## EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Application Details & Constraints					
Case Ref:	EPF/2599/24	PL No:	006901		
Site Address:	Loft conversion with gable end and dormer roof.				
Proposal:	14, Courtland Drive, Chigwell, IG7 6PN				
Green Belt	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TPO	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Conservation Area	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Heritage Asset (Listed)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Flood Zone	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Enforcement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Representations					
Town/Parish Council Comments, if any:					
Objection	<input type="checkbox"/>	No Objection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Neighbour Responses, if any:		None			

Planning Considerations			
<p>Character and Appearance:</p> <p>The application site is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse located within a built up area of Chigwell. The host dwelling and several adjacent dwellings are sited in a staggered position within the streetscene.</p> <p>This application is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme EPF/1916/24. Grounds for refusal were due to design and impact on neighbouring amenities.</p> <p>The proposal comprises a hip to gable extension of the rear projecting roof with two large flat-topped dormers straddling both sides of the gable roof. Together the proposed dormers are of a form, positioning, size, and scale which is considered incongruous within the roofscape. The proposal results in a box like appearance introducing a heavy quality to an already busy roof form. At a reduced scale the east dormer could be acceptable given its visibility is reduced from all directions. No revisions to the form of the west dormer extension are proposed. Revisions include obscured glazing to the window and a single roof light per dormer. This does not overcome the harmful visual impact already identified in the previous refusal. As previously noted, double dormers are generally not accepted within the same roof plane and no other similar examples of larger dormers exist within the site context.</p> <p>Whilst it is accepted the proposed development would not be visible within the streetscene, the spatial relationship with dwellings to the west would have far-reaching negative impact to the visual amenity and character and appearance of the area. The proposal is therefore not supported.</p>			
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>

## EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Neighbouring Amenities: Obscured glass to the dormer window would overcome the issue of overlooking. The proposed dormer to the west at 5m wide results in a dominating addition to the roof and would result in a negative visual impact to neighbouring dwellings to the west.			
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
N/A <input type="checkbox"/>			
Green Belt:			
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Highway Safety/Parking:			
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Trees and Landscaping:			
Acceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>	Unacceptable	<input type="checkbox"/>
N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Comments on Representations, if any:			
Additional Notes:			
<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		<b>Approve</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Refuse</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>