

## Parish Council Planning Committee

### Officer Report

**Application:** EPF/0755/26

**Site:** The Rodings, Roding Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6BE

**Proposal:** Single storey side and rear extension.

### Recommendation

As the site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt, the recommendation should reflect the Parish Council's standard Green Belt position:

The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate development in Green Belt whether with or without special circumstances. The Council, therefore, **OBJECTS** to this application. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection.

### Assessment

The application proposes single storey side and rear extensions to an existing large dwelling within a spacious Green Belt plot. The plans show matching materials and no change to access or parking. In visual terms, the additions appear modest in relation to the size of the existing house and site.

The planning history, already itemised in the agenda, remains an important material consideration. It shows a substantial fallback position at the site, including lawful or accepted prior development rights for a replacement outbuilding and other larger additions. That said, the previous history is not entirely straightforward. In particular, EPF/1649/22 was found not lawful, because the side extensions and garage would have been forward of the principal elevation and therefore not permitted development. That part of the history should not be treated as a lawful fallback.

For information, I have checked the earlier drawings and the area figures should be treated with care. The current existing plans show the house at 630m<sup>2</sup> total, with 352m<sup>2</sup> at ground floor. The current proposal appears to increase the ground floor to about 380m<sup>2</sup>, giving an uplift of roughly 28m<sup>2</sup> if the upper floors remain unchanged. That comparison is useful, but only approximate. The earlier schemes do not all use the same basis of measurement, and some refer to footprint while others refer to floor area.

The same caution applies to comparisons with the fallback schemes. The earlier material does support the general point that the site has had scope for materially larger development, but exact area increases are not directly comparable across all the applications. For example, the 2022 lawful development material refers to a proposed dwelling footprint of 598.7m<sup>2</sup>, plus a garage of 49.7m<sup>2</sup> and a poolhouse of 381.8m<sup>2</sup>, which is a different measure from internal floorspace. Accordingly, while the general fallback point remains sound, any square metre comparison should be described as approximate only.

Given the size of the plot and the separation to neighbours, there is no obvious significant harm to neighbouring amenity from the submitted plans. There also appears to be no clear issue on parking, access or flood risk from the material submitted.

### Officer view

In ordinary planning terms, there is a reasonable case that this proposal is acceptable. It is single storey, appears subordinate to the existing house, and is less extensive than parts of the site's broader planning fallback position. However, because the site is within the Green Belt, the Parish Council's usual approach is to maintain its standard objection to proposals which may amount to inappropriate development, while making clear that this objection can be waived if the local planning authority's officers consider the proposal acceptable.

**Suggested Parish Council response**

The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate development in Green Belt whether with or without special circumstances. The Council, therefore, **OBJECTS** to this application. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection.