

Parish Council Planning Committee

Officer Report

Application site: 12 Barnaby Way, Chigwell, IG7 6NZ

Proposal: Partial demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and construction of side and rear extensions, continuing the established roof form.

Recommendation

That the Parish Council raises no objection, subject to conditions, unless members take the view that the increased bulk on this elevated plot remains harmful to the street scene.

Site and proposal

The property is a detached two-storey dwelling on a rising site within Barnaby Way. The current house already has a mixture of projecting elements, including a side garage and rear additions. The proposal removes the existing side and rear extensions and garage and replaces them with a larger side and rear form of development. The submitted drawings show a more unified house form with a front set-back over the former garage area, a larger rear projection, and a revised roof design which remains below the existing ridge. The proposed accommodation would create a larger family house with four bedrooms at first floor and enlarged living space at ground floor.

Relevant planning background

The planning statement records that application EPF/0254/25 for a two-storey rear extension, single-storey side extension and first-floor side build-over was refused. The same statement says the current scheme has been revised in response to those earlier concerns and also in response to pre-application advice under PRE/0048/26. The applicant says the present design keeps the new work below the existing ridge height, removes the loft element, replaces the previously criticised crown roof with a hipped form, introduces set-ins and staggered elements to reduce bulk, removes the parapet wall, and sets the front extension back so that it reads more as a subordinate addition. Those are all material considerations in favour of the revised scheme.

Assessment

The main issue is design, scale and effect on the street scene. The house sits on elevated land and so any increase in size is likely to be quite visible. The proposed street elevation shows that the dwelling would become broader and more substantial than the existing house, particularly through the build-over of the side element and the enlarged rear mass that rises above the present single-storey form. Even so, the revised scheme appears noticeably more controlled than the previously refused version as described in the planning statement. The ridge is not raised, the loft conversion has been removed, the side addition is set back from the front wall and the roof now reads as a continuation of the existing hipped form rather than a more awkward or top-heavy roof arrangement. On balance, the revised design can reasonably be seen as a more coherent whole than the current building and not obviously out of keeping with a street of individually varied detached houses.

The next issue is neighbour impact. The applicant has tried to address this through the amended form of the extensions and by showing 45-degree lines on the proposed site plan. The submitted plan is intended to demonstrate that the revised rear extension does not breach the neighbouring right-to-light test relied on by the applicant. From the drawings, the side and rear additions are

substantial, but they appear to have been shaped to reduce the more overbearing features of the previous scheme, particularly by avoiding the earlier roof form and by stepping the front element back. There remains some risk that neighbouring occupiers could see the proposal as bulky, especially given the rising site levels, but on the material provided the revised scheme does appear to have made a genuine attempt to reduce harm.

Materials and detailing are proposed to match the existing dwelling, including render, brick and clay tiles. The planning statement says the access remains unchanged. There is no indication in the submitted material of a new planning issue relating to parking or access. In design terms, the key judgment is therefore whether the increase in size is now acceptable in light of the earlier refusal. In officer view, there is a reasonable case that the revised scheme has overcome the strongest earlier concerns, though members could still take a stricter view on bulk because of the site's elevated position.

Officer view

This is no longer the same form of development that was refused previously. The changes described by the applicant are significant: the ridge is not lifted, the loft element has gone, the parapet has been removed, the front build-over has been set back and the roof form has been simplified into a lower hipped arrangement. Those changes all go to the heart of the previous design concerns. For that reason, it appears the revised scheme is capable of being regarded as acceptable, subject to careful control of materials and implementation.

Recommendation to committee

Recommended response:

That the Parish Council **raises no objection** but if members are minded to make comments, it would be sensible to request conditions requiring materials to match the existing dwelling and any flank windows at first-floor level that could give rise to overlooking to be fixed shut and obscure glazed.

Alternative recommendation if members remain concerned

If members consider that the elevated position of the plot still makes the proposal too bulky, an alternative recommendation would be:

That the Parish Council **objects** on the grounds that, notwithstanding the revisions, the proposal would still result in an overly large and visually intrusive extension to a dwelling on an elevated site, causing harm to the character of the host property and the street scene and failing to appear sufficiently subordinate.