

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

| Application Details & Constraints | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Case Ref: | EPF/2229/22 | PL No: | 002426 | | |
| Site Address: | 34, Broad Oaks, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6DW | | | | |
| Proposal: | New two storey dwelling with attic storey and double basement accommodation, as an enlargement of the implemented scheme EPF/2719/21 | | | | |
| Green Belt | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | TPO (Veteran Trees) | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input 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"/> | None Received <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| Neighbour Responses, if any: | | <p>Tailours, 59 High Road (Objection):</p> <p><i>This proposed new dwelling will be in the green belt. As a result I object to its construction. We need to preserve the green areas locally, and prevent over-development. The new house now under construction on this site is already a huge increase on what was there before. It does not seem appropriate to have further development.</i></p> <p><i>I must also comment on the fact that the planning proposal has been submitted just before Christmas, with the consultation period to take place over the festive season. This suggests that the plans may be controversial, and hence that they have been submitted at a time when the diligence of residents and others is diminished. While this is not in itself a reason to object, it reinforces the concerns expressed above.</i></p> | | | |

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Tree Officer Response: | <p><i>We have a HOLDING OBJECTION on this application on the grounds that it is contrary to –</i></p> <p><i>Policy LL10 – Adequacy for the provision of landscape retention</i></p> <p><i>Policy DM5 Submission version of EFDC Local Plan (Dec 2017) –</i></p> <p><i>‘Development proposals must be accompanied by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the retention and protection of trees (including veteran trees)....’</i></p> <p>Justification</p> <p><i>The Arb report submitted with this application is not acceptable – it relates to tree protection for the layout approved under EPF/ 2719/21. This current proposal increases the width of the building and will impact on the tree protection areas of retained trees. The CBA drawing ‘proposed site layout’ (drawing number TAE-1001) has overlaid the proposed layout so that the topo information (including tree locations) is no longer visible.</i></p> <p><i>Up to date Arb reports are required to support the proposal. It is not appropriate or acceptable to condition the provision of this information, even if there have been similar applications on the site. Tree reports (that address the current application proposal) should always be submitted for consideration as part of a planning application. To condition it is too late, as a tree reports findings may not be capable of influencing design, potentially resulting in loss or damage to important tree assets.</i></p> <p><i>As required in the Council’s validation check list, existing and proposed plans should clearly show the whole site, including outbuildings and the trees on/adjacent to the site – this information should be taken from the Arboricultural reports. They should clearly show what is present on the ‘existing’ plans, and what is intended to be retained on ‘proposed’ plans.</i></p> <p><i>We have a statutory duty to consider the preservation and planting of trees when granting planning permission, and our Local Plan Policies support this duty. The potential effect of development on all trees is a material consideration irrespective of whether they are protected by TPO/ conservation area status, or not.</i></p> <p><i>Lack of the required information will be grounds for refusal, in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal could be implemented without a detrimental impact on trees on or adjacent to the site (ie is contrary to Policy LL10 / DM5).</i></p> <p><i>Until such time as the above information has been provided and assessed we OBJECT to the application on the grounds that ‘tree related information has not been provided. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposal could be implemented without a detrimental impact on trees’</i></p> <p><i>Should further information be forthcoming please re-consult.</i></p> |
|------------------------|---|

Planning Considerations

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Character and Appearance:

The application site previously contained a large detached house which has now been demolished. The site is large and secluded, to the east of High Road, Chigwell. The site is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and includes a number of protected trees.

The proposal seeks consent for a large detached three storey dwelling with two basement levels, as an enlargement of the implemented scheme EPF/2719/21.

Compared with EPF/2719/21, this current scheme seeks to increase the width of the dwelling from 81.3m to 95.8m with a proposed depth increase from 27.7m to 30.7m. Given the size of the approved dwelling under EPF/2719/21, it is not considered appropriate to further allow an increase of this size.

The original dwelling in this case should be considered against the current scheme. The original consent for a replacement dwelling at this site was approved under EPF/1107/20. Although the design of the scheme has not changed significantly since the previous consents, the current scheme in comparison with the original dwelling is dramatic increase and is considered unacceptable in terms of size and bulk.

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|

Neighbouring Amenities:

The proposal will not have a negative impact on neighbour amenity given the distance between neighbouring properties.

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Acceptable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----|--------------------------|

Green Belt:

The site is located within the boundaries of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework ("The Framework") and the Epping Forest District Local Plan ("EFDLP") identify that inappropriate forms of development in the Green Belt should not be approved unless very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh the harm caused. In order to comply with the relevant exception to inappropriate development identified by the Framework and the EFDLP, the new building cannot be materially larger than the one it replaces. Volumetric calculations were requested from the agent however none were provided. The original dwelling granted under EPF/1107/20 states a gross internal area of 4,162m², whilst the current scheme states a gross internal area of 7,614m². This represents an 80% increase in internal floorspace compared with the original. The proposed scheme is therefore clearly materially larger than the original building.

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|

Highway Safety/Parking:

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|
| Acceptable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----|-------------------------------------|

Trees and Landscaping:

As set out above, the Council's Trees and Landscape Officer was consulted and objects to the proposal due to the provision of insufficient information.

| | | | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| Acceptable | <input type="checkbox"/> | Unacceptable | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| Comments on Representations, if any: | | | |
| Additional Notes: | | | |
| Officer Recommendation: | Approve | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refuse <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |