

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Application Details & Constraints							
Case Ref:	EPF/1958/25	PL No:	32624				
Site Address:	20, Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5HZ						
Proposal:	Proposed ground floor rear extension, part first floor rear and double storey side extension. Alterations to roof and front bay windows.						
Green Belt	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TPO (Veteran Trees)	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							
<p>Town/Parish Council Comments, if any:</p> <p><i>The Council OBJECTED to the proposal on the basis that the extensions and alterations would cause an unacceptable loss of light to the adjoining property and would significantly reduce the effectiveness and revenue of the neighbour's solar panels. It was noted that similar temporary works nearby had already caused a substantial loss of solar income and that the increased roof height now proposed would further reduce the exposure of the panels.</i></p> <p><i>The Council also considered that the proposed Juliette balcony would create overlooking into neighbouring gardens and rooms and would therefore harm the privacy of adjoining occupiers.</i></p>							
Objection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No Objection	<input type="checkbox"/>	Comment	<input type="checkbox"/>	None Received	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 Oak Lodge Ave	<p>OBJECTION summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of sunlight to No.18 affecting an upstairs bedroom, the landing and solar panels; The addition would appear overbearing from No.18; It would also create a visual intrusion to the privacy of No.18 due to its close proximity and height. 						
22 Oak Lodge Ave	<p>OBJECTION summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excessive scale, massing, footprint and design are out of character with the area; Loss of light and overshadowing to No.22 as the application site sits on higher land; The multiple new side-facing and rear-facing windows, and Juliet balconies would create opportunities for direct overlooking into rear garden and habitable rooms of No.22; The application incorrectly states that there are no mature trees or hedges on or near the shared boundary; Potential for intensified residential use, inconsistent with the area's character and planning history. 						
Cadent	NO OBJECTION – informative requested.						

Relevant Planning History

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

None.

Site Description

The application site comprises a link-detached two-storey dwelling on the west side of Oak Lodge Avenue. Oak Lodge Avenue slopes upwards from south to north, meaning the application dwelling sits on higher land than No.22 and lower land than No.18.

Planning Considerations

Character and Appearance:

Development proposals for extensions or alterations to residential buildings are required to respect and/or complement the form and detailing of the original building. Furthermore, a development must contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area by relating positively to its context and making a positive contribution to a place.

Whilst the principle of a ground floor rear extension, part first floor rear extension, and double storey side extension to the application dwelling may be acceptable; the extensions and alterations proposed to the roof are not. The use of a crown roof creates an excessive bulk at second floor level, uncomplimentary to the original dwelling, and out of character for the area. The proposal represents an overbearing and unsympathetic form of development which would be highly visible when viewed as part of the street scene and is therefore unacceptable.

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

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Neighbouring Amenities:

Development proposals must take account of the privacy and amenity of the development's occupiers and neighbours. The Council will expect proposals to provide good sunlight/daylight, avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and the occupiers, and not result in an over-bearing or overly enclosed form of development which materially impacts on either the outlook of occupiers of neighbouring properties or the occupiers.

No.18 Oak Lodge Ave

- Loss of daylight/sunlight and overbearingess
 Whilst the proposal would result in a considerable increase in bulk and mass at second floor/roof level, the application dwelling would sit adjacent to No.18 which has no habitable room side windows.
 The proposed GF extension would protrude 3.1m further rearwards than No.18's GF, and the proposed FF extension would protrude 2m further rearwards than No.18's FF; these are considered acceptable depths particularly given the properties are separated by a No.18's garage and the 45 degree rule is adhered to.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
 All side facing windows proposed would be of obscured glazing and only openable above 1.7m. The proposed Juliet balconies would not create a detrimental increase in overlooking over and above what is currently possible from existing FF windows which is commonplace for a residential built-up urban setting such Oak Lodge Avenue.

No.22 Oak Lodge Ave

- Loss of daylight/sunlight and overbearingess
 Whilst the proposal would result in a considerable increase in bulk and mass at second floor/roof level, the application dwelling would sit adjacent to No.22 which has no habitable room side windows.
 The proposed GF extension would protrude 3.1m further rearwards than No.22's GF which is acceptable. However, the proposed FF extension would protrude 3.9m further rearwards than No.18's FF and whilst, the 45 degree rule is adhered to, this does not take into account that the application dwellings sits on higher ground to No.22 nor the excessive bulk and mass due to the scale and design of the roof. As such, the proposed first floor rear addition would impact the outlook of the occupiers of No.22 by appearing over-bearing when viewed from their rear habitable room window closest to the boundary with the application dwelling.
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
 All side facing windows proposed would be of obscured glazing and only openable above 1.7m. The proposed Juliet balconies would not create a detrimental increase in overlooking over and above what is currently possible from existing FF windows which is commonplace for a residential built-up urban setting such Oak Lodge Avenue.

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

EFDC Householder & Other Minor Applications Check List

Trees and Landscaping:

There are a number of trees on the site and as such the feasibility of the proposal in relation to trees needs to be demonstrated. Lack of the necessary information is grounds for refusal. The following tree related information should be submitted with any future applications –

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment to include - full tree survey and tree retention / removal plan.
- Evaluation of tree constraints;
- Retained trees and Root Protection Areas (RPAs) to be shown on proposed layout plans;
- Strategic hard and soft landscape design, including species and location of new tree planting;
- Arboricultural method statement to demonstrate feasibility, without causing harm to the tree, particularly when construction is said to be necessary within the RPAs;
- Tree protection plan;
- Additional information eg a daylight / sunlight assessment, may also be required depending on the site conditions, retained trees and development proposal.

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

Comments on Representations, if any:

No.18 objected to the proposal on the grounds that it would result in a loss of sunlight to their solar panels; whilst the proposal may result in some loss of sunlight, the consequences of this are not detrimental to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and is not therefore contrary to policy DM9 of the Local Plan.

Additional Notes:

The application is recommended for refusal.

Officer Recommendation:	Approve <input type="checkbox"/>	Refuse <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------	----------------------------------	--