



MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 9 January 2025

Time: 6:30pm

Location: Parish Offices, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QX

Members present:

Cllr Celina Jefcoate (Chair)

Cllr Lorraine Clarke

Cllr Debby Rye #

Cllr Lisa Morgan Skingsley

Cllr.Osman Ali #

For part of the meeting

Members of the Public and Councillors were asked to **NOTE** that in accordance with Standing Orders 3 (i) and the Local Government Transparency Code 2015, photographing, recording, broadcasting, transmitting or otherwise reporting the proceeding of a meeting may take place.

Councillors were asked to **NOTE** that in the exercise of their functions, they must take note of the following: equal opportunities; crime and disorder; human rights; health and safety and biodiversity

PL341/24 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were **ACCEPTED** from Cllrs; Hodds, Costa, Alemudunm Areadon and Rizvi

PL342/24 - OTHER ABSENCES

None

PL343/24 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Jefcoate declared a personal interest in items 7 (Rest Harrow) on the grounds of knowing the architect. She deemed it would not influence her decision and she would remain in the meeting. Cllr Morgan Kingsley declared a personal interest in items 11 and 12 (Oak Lodge Ave) on the grounds of living in the same road. She deemed it would not influence her decision and she would remain in the meeting.

PL344/24 - MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held 12 December 2024 were **AGREED**

PL345/24 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

22 members of the public were in attendance>. The Chair brought item 20 (140 Hainault Road, and 22 (38 Milwell Crescent) forward as there were public speakers for these items

To **CONSIDER** the following applications received for the weeks ending 6th, 13th, 20th and 24th December 2024

PL346/24 - [EPF/2501/24](#) - Guru Gobind Singh Khalsa College, Roding Lane, Chigwell, Essex IG7 6BQ

Proposed new special educational needs and disabilities (SEND) school including playing fields alongside a landscape led enabling residential development including conversion of existing college building to residential, partial demolition of existing outbuildings, provision of flexible Class F2 floorspace and associated works.

Should officers be minded to recommend approval, please take this as notification that the Parish Council wish to speak to make representations of their objections to the relevant Planning Committee, A or B

Four members of the public spoke in objection

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** on the following grounds:

LACK OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTION

Policy requires that 40% of the proposed 221 units are affordable or an equivalent off site contribution is made. The applicant proposes zero contribution for affordable housing in the district. The PPG firmly places the onus on the applicant to justify their departure from policy and the Parish consider the Viability Assessment of December 2024 fails to justify this departure. The applicant continues to fail to engage with several of the critical areas raised by BPS, the Council's own independent advisors in their report on the previous viability submission. BPS considered all these aspects should be addressed in order to give credibility to any application

The Parish await publication of the BPS review of Mr James Brown's Financial Viability Assessment of December 2024 that accompanies the application and reserves the right to comment further when that is received.

Mr Brown's viability report and need for an enabling development is based on the assumption that the existing school cannot be refurbished. The Gerald Eve valuation report considers the school can be viably refurbished, casting doubt over the applicant's claims that an enabling development is necessary

Mr Brown's approach appears circular, seeking support for his assessment of EUV using land sales at prices which assumed little or no affordable housing provision.

If the applicant proposes that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is lower than the district wide target on viability grounds, it is his responsibility to demonstrate that is so

(Holgate J, *Parkhurst Road Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and London Borough of Islington*).

In the absence of an RICS compliant viability assessment accompanying the application or comments on the same from BPS, the Council's own advisors, the Parish consider Mr Brown has failed to evidence the claimed maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing is zero.

The Parish consider the proposal should be **REFUSED on the grounds it conflicts with Policy H2 (Affordable Housing) of the Local Plan which requires 40% on-site affordable housing**

FAILURE TO MEET IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEED

The site is not an allocated site in the Local Plan. The Council has an adopted Local Plan and can demonstrate it is meeting its five year land supply; the applicant has failed to provide up to date evidence to the contrary.

A significant part of the adopted Local Plan is that overall, 25% of the housing units delivered over the lifetime of the Local Plan will be affordable in the form of shared ownership or below market rent.

Policy SP1 (Spatial Development Strategy) of the Local Plan requires a minimum of 2,851 new affordable homes are delivered by developers between 2016-2033

[EFDC Infrastructure Funding Statements](#) show developments delivered a total of 9 new affordable homes in the period 2019-2023 and 56 in the period 23/24

The applicant's failure to deliver any of the required 40% on site affordable housing is considered by the Parish a far greater risk to the Council being able to meet its target of affordable housing delivery. The provision of new housing that does not adequately contribute to the housing mix of the area by omitting any on-site AH is not considered a special circumstance that outweighs the harm to the Green Belt

The Parish consider the proposal should be **REFUSED on the grounds it conflicts with Policy SP1 (Spatial Development Strategy) of the Local Plan which commits to a minimum of 2,851 new affordable homes between 2016-2033**

LACK OF IDENTIFIED NEED FOR 68 SEND PLACES

The proposal fails to demonstrate the need for additional Band 4+ (specialist rather than mainstream) SEND provision in the area.

The EFDC Infrastructure Delivery Plan ([EB1100](#)) reports a need for SEND provision in EFDC in outlying rural areas including eastern parts of EFDC. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan noted in 2016 the District's only SEND school provision in Epping Forest District were Wells Park (residential) in Chigwell and Oak View in Loughton and none in West Essex. Since the finalising of the IDP, Luxborough Court School has opened in Chigwell.

OFSTED reported the SEND school (Luxborough Court School) which provides for 5-19 year olds was operating at 1/5th of capacity as of November 2023 (150 places, 31 pupils). The Band 4 sixth form at Luxborough Court School had no pupils as of Nov 2023. Despite available local capacity, an

additional 68 places are proposed on Green Belt. The applicant states LCS is only suitable for those with mild to moderate needs but fails to evidence this statement.

The developer's Alternative Site Assessment fails to take into account the preferred Local Plan allocating of SEND provision to serve rural areas and West Essex by excluding sites in excess of a 20 minutes drive from Oak View School.

INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT IN GREEN BELT

For the above reasons the Parish consider that the proposed Special Circumstances (68 SEND places for 14-19 year olds) will not deliver sufficient benefit in the area to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt

It is noted the QRP was not asked to consider whether this was appropriate development in Green Belt but only to focus on the masterplan layout.

The Parish **NOTED** the recent refusals at appeal due to the impact on Green Belt of two applications within 200m of the site.

The Parish consider this proposal to be inappropriate development on Green Belt. The Framework clearly states that the matter of inappropriate development is dependent upon a proposal preserving the openness of the Green Belt or the reasons for including land in it. Overall the site will have a more intensively developed character as a result of the introduction of buildings across a larger proportion of the site. This would be harmful to the openness in spatial terms compared with the existing building and uses of the site.

The fundamental aim of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The EFDC Green Belt review confirmed this land makes a very high contribution to the purpose of preventing urban sprawl. The proposal would result in a permanent urbanising encroachment into the Green Belt between the settlements of Buckhurst Hill and Chigwell. The openness of the Green Belt would be significantly reduced due to the scale and massing of the proposed buildings. For sites where there are existing buildings, structures or hard surfacing a change of use could preserve the openness of the Green Belt or not conflict with the purposes for including land in it. The Parish consider this is not the case in this instance.

The development is exposed to general public view and the development would be conspicuous from the road. There would therefore be harm to the openness of the Green Belt in visual terms. The proposal would erode the openness of the Green Belt within the site and its immediate surroundings to a degree that would be materially harmful.

The Parish consider the proposal to be inappropriate development in Green Belt and consider the application should be **REFUSED on the grounds it conflicts with the NPPF and Policy DM4 of the EFLP**

CAR USE AND THE AMENITY OF FUTURE AND EXISTING RESIDENTS

The Parish agrees with the Quality Review Panel's most recent concern that the site location could be overly reliant on cars which could risk the development becoming a dormitory location.

As the QRP notes, public transport in this location is limited with relatively infrequent bus services to the site. Congestion on the main road is considerable

The findings of the EFDC report of site selection ([EB801O](#)) should be noted, namely

A number of transport issues are evident in Chigwell which place real constraints on the ability of the settlement to grow its population successfully.

These include:

*the peak time bottlenecks at the three exit routes (**B170**, A123 and A1168);
the lack of buses with only one service existing which connects Chigwell to Loughton; and
the lack of capacity at peak travel periods on the London Underground.*

When proposing this development on the B170 Roding Lane the Parish consider the applicant has not properly addressed these findings of the Local Plan. There is insufficient incentive or improvement proposed to public transport, cycleways or footpaths between the development and the town centres of Loughton, the transport hub of Buckhurst Hill and the village of Chigwell. Cycle hire and a proposed cycle route is a welcome inclusion but with the lack of any further cycle paths in Chigwell or Buckhurst Hill it is not considered there is sufficient infrastructure to support this as an attractive choice for residents

The EFDC Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Schedule ([EB1101B](#)) identifies required cycling infrastructure CH6 that this development would be expected to fund in full if granted

The proposed GP is welcome but there is insufficient evidence provided to explain its catchment area and means of travel to it.

It is considered the proposal will result in over reliance on cars and will adversely impact on the amenity of the local area. The Parish consider the proposal should be **REFUSED on the grounds it conflicts with Local Plan Objective E (i) which requires new development be located in areas where there are the greatest opportunities for utilising public transport and cycling and walking instead of private car use.**

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with policy T1 of the EFLP which requires that the development does not result in a cumulative severe impact of the operation of local highway networks.**

PARKING

The Parish Council consider the application in conflict with the adopted Local Plan due to the significant reduction in the parking allocation of the site. Given the density of the site the reduction in car parking spaces from the quantum required by Essex Design Guide is not considered viable in this location. It is noted the QRP consider the density should be reduced if parking issues cannot be resolved

The applicant's travel reports indicate the site is a considerable distance (1400m+) from shops, services and underground. Given the recognised limited and infrequent bus service and lack of cycle path provision, journeys to Chigwell and Buckhurst Hill are unlikely to be undertaken by non vehicular modes.

The Parish asks officers and members to not the dismissal of Appeal [3341661](#) (Front Site, Grange Farm, Chigwell) which proposed a 25% reduction in parking allocation against Essex Standards for a proposal on Green Belt.

Although closer (620m) to services and shops, the appeal was dismissed on the grounds it conflicted with policy T1 of the EFDLP which requires that the appropriate parking is provided on new developments in terms of the amount provided.

The Parish consider this application will result in the under-provision of parking spaces provided. The distance of the proposed site from services and facilities would inevitably result in future occupiers needing to make vehicle trips to access services and facilities. Therefore future occupiers are likely to require private vehicles. As such there is insufficient justification for a reduction in the amount of parking spaces to be provided.

For 221 dwellings, the applicant proposes 171 parking spaces of which 38 are garages to some of the 61 two, three and four bed houses in Meadow View. The applicant proposes an additional 8 visitor parking spaces for the development of 221 dwellings, giving a total of 141 spaces plus 38 garages.

Policy T1 of the EFLP refers to the Essex County Council Parking Standards which would require a total of 358 spaces for a development of this number of dwellings (302 for residents and 56 for visitors). The provisions for alternative transport are not considered sufficient to outweigh the significant harm to the amenity of future residents that the reduction in parking proposed will cause

The Local Plan identifies two Town Centres in the District, Epping High Street and Loughton High Road. Policy T1 of the Local Plan states that reduced parking will be considered when practicable and within 400m of a station and/or a town centre or similar sustainable location. The site is not within 400m of a station, and/or the site is not in the centre of Loughton, Epping or a similar sustainable location.

Local Plan Submitted Evidence document [EB503](#) - Local Plan Transport Assessment Report, Essex Highways considered all relevant sites for Car Free/Reduced Parking developments and assessed trip rates per unit (table 6-6). The Essex Highways assessment only considered flatted developments in Town Centres or within 400m of LUL stations as relevant and appropriate for Car Free/Reduced Parking Development.

None of the qualifying criteria set out in the Essex Parking Standards or the adopted Local Plan for reducing parking allocation are met, therefore this proposal should comply with ECC 2009 Standards. As it does not include a minimum of 358 parking spaces required under ECC 2009 Standards, instead proposing 133 plus 38 garages and 8 visitor spaces, it fails to comply with LP Policy T1.

The Parish do not expect ECC Highways Officers to raise the matter of parking quantum. EFDC are the parking and planning authority and as such, Essex Highways would not advise on the quantum of individual applications. The Parish's objection is based on the applicant's failure to comply with the Epping Forest Local Plan policy T1.

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with policy T1 of the EFLP which requires that the appropriate parking is provided on new developments in terms of the amount provided.**

POOR DESIGN AND LIVING SPACE STANDARDS

The proposal to convert the school into flats has resulted in a cramped and poor quality, high density design contrary to Policy DM9 of the Local Plan

The applicant claims to adhere to London National Standards; best practice home are 10-14% larger than National Minimum Standards. This is clearly not the case. The EFLP policy DM10B specifies proposals comply with National Living Space Standards. The Parish consider the drawings do not provide sufficient evidence that the proposal even meets National Living Standards. Whilst not checking every flat, there are enough possible anomalies to cause concern regarding the design and layout of the proposal.

Standard 10 of the Technical Requirements state dwellings must provide at least the gross internal floor area and built in storage area set out in the Standard. For a one bed, one person flat with bath that is 39sq m of floor space and a minimum 1m of built in storage. For example, Flat A.01.08, whilst claiming to be 42 sq m, does not appear to comply according to the submitted drawings. A 1B2P flat should deliver a minimum gross internal floor area of 50 sq m and an internal storage of at least 1.5sq m. A.01.16 while claiming to be 50.2 sq m and A.01.20 (alleging 50.3 sq m) appear not to comply according to the drawn plan.

Not all flats have been checked by the Parish and it is asked, given officers appear to be minded to recommend approval, that adherence to National Living Space standards is conditioned as part of any approval and confirmed during construction

FLOODING

Parts of the site are in the [Middle River Roding flood alert area](#). The last alert for this area was 8 Jan 2025. There have been 46 [Historic Flood Alerts](#) for this area in the last 12 months, 108 in the last three years and 204 in the last five years. The flood alert areas include the site of the development the school, pitch and changing rooms

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with Objective E (iv) of the Local Plan which requires that new development is located away from areas of risk of flooding**

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with Policy DM15 of the Local Plan which requires that new development is located away from areas of risk of flooding**

Cllr Ali joined the meeting

#Cllr Rye left the meeting

PL347/24 - [EPF/2513/24](#) - 142, Manor Road, Chigwell, IG7 5PR

Variation of condition 2 'Plan no's' on planning permission EPF/1905/22 (Demolition of 1 x detached dwelling and an erection of two buildings to accommodate 9 x 2 bed flats, along with parking amenity and landscaping).

Summary of proposal: remove basement and associated 11 parking spaces, replace with 9 forecourt parking spaces

Should officers be minded to recommend approval, please take this as notification that the Parish Council wish to speak to make representations of their objections to the relevant Planning Committee, A or B

A member of the public spoke in objection

The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** on the following grounds:

This is clearly an alteration of the description of the previously approved proposal and as such the Parish consider the proposed changes are a material amendment and a complete new planning application is required.

The reduction in on site parking has the potential to adversely impact on the amenity of neighbours and as such the Parish consider the proposed changes are a material amendment and a complete new planning application is required.

Notwithstanding the Parish's belief the proposed changes are a material amendment, objections to the proposal were raised as follows:

PARKING

The Parish Council consider the application in conflict with the adopted Local Plan due to the significant reduction in the parking allocation of the site. Given the density of the site the reduction in car parking spaces from the quantum required by Essex Design Guide is not considered viable in this location.

The site is 650m from a LUL underground station. Given the recognised limited and infrequent bus service and lack of cycle path provision, most journeys are unlikely to be undertaken by non vehicular modes.

The Parish asks officers and members to not the dismissal of Appeal [3341661](#) (Front Site, Grange Farm, Chigwell) which proposed a 25% reduction in parking allocation against Essex Standards.

Although closer to a LUL station (620m) than this site, the appeal was dismissed on the grounds it conflicted with policy T1 of the EFDLP which requires that the appropriate parking is provided on new developments in terms of the amount provided.

The Parish consider this application will result in the under-provision of parking spaces provided. The distance of the proposed site from services and facilities would inevitably result in future occupiers needing to make vehicle trips to access services and facilities. Therefore future occupiers are likely to require private vehicles. As such there is insufficient justification for a further reduction in the amount of parking spaces to be provided.

For 9 dwellings, the applicant proposes 9 parking spaces, a reduction on the previously approved 11 and a 57% reduction in parking allocation against Essex Standards.

Policy T1 of the EFLP refers to the Essex County Council Parking Standards which would require a total of 21 spaces for this development (18 residents and 3 visitors). The provisions for alternative transport are not considered sufficient to outweigh the significant harm to the amenity of future residents that the reduction in parking proposed will cause.

The Local Plan identifies two Town Centres in the District, Epping High Street and Loughton High Road. Policy T1 of the Local Plan states that reduced parking will be considered when practicable and within 400m of a station and/or a town centre or similar sustainable location. The site is not within 400m of a station, and/or the site is not in the centre of Loughton, Epping or a similar sustainable location.

Local Plan Submitted Evidence document [EB503](#) - Local Plan Transport Assessment Report, Essex Highways considered all relevant sites for Car Free/Reduced Parking developments and assessed trip rates per unit (table 6-6). The Essex Highways assessment only considered flattened developments in Town Centres or within 400m of LUL stations as relevant and appropriate for Car Free/Reduced Parking Development.

None of the qualifying criteria set out in the Essex Parking Standards or the adopted Local Plan for reducing parking allocation are met, therefore this proposal should comply with ECC 2009 Standards. As it does not include a minimum of 358 parking spaces required under ECC 2009 Standards, instead proposing 133 plus 38 garages and 8 visitor spaces, it fails to comply with LP Policy T1.

The Parish Council continues to receive complaints from residents of this area of Manor Road about the risks being created by on street parking by residents and visitors of existing flats.

Within 50m of the proposed site there are already several blocks of flats, none of which meet Essex Parking Standards, being granted permission before the adoption of the Local Plan.

These are:

- 146 Hainault Road (PP granted 2018) - 11 x 2 bed flats with 11 parking spaces (EPS requires 25)
- Silver Hind, 124 Manor Road (PP granted 2011) - 14 x 2 and 3 bed flats with 29 parking spaces (EPS requires 32)
- 126 Manor Road (PP granted 2016) - 12 x 2 and 3 bed flats with 14 spaces (EPS requires 32)
- 105 Manor Road, Chigwell (granted 2018) - 4 x 2 and a 1 bed flat with four space (EPS requires 8)
- 109 Manor Road, (granted 2011) - 11 x 2 bed, 2 x 1 bed with 13 parking spaces (EPS requires 28)

There is substantive evidence to support the Parish position that the proposed car parking is inadequate. The existing situation is that car parking capacity in the area has been exceeded and the subsequent parking on the street is detrimental to highway safety and the amenity of neighbours. The on-street parking stress situation has become so severe that parking restrictions at and around the location of the site are being proposed to the local Highways Panel by local Councillors. A previous Transport Technical Note has identified significant levels of half on kerb parking in the area and very limited available on street overnight parking spaces. The proposal seeks to remove the previously approved basement parking areas resulting in an overall reduction in parking provision for the development. The proposed remaining number of parking spaces is considered to be inadequate for the proposal and would likely lead to further on street parking to the detriment of highway safety.

The Parish do not expect ECC Highways Officers to raise the matter of parking quantum. EFDC are the parking and planning authority and as such, Essex Highways would not advise on the quantum of individual applications. The Parish's objection is based on the applicant's failure to comply with the Epping Forest Local Plan policy T1.

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with policy T1 of the EFLP which requires that the appropriate parking is provided on new developments in terms of the amount provided.**

FLOODING

The Parish attach photographic evidence of recent flooding at the site (Minute Appendix 1). Flooding regularly occurs at this location. It is considered the proposed substantial increase in

hard standing and the removal of rainwater harvesting will lead to increased flood risk and subsequent damage to St Winifred's church and neighbouring buildings.

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED** given it conflicts with **Policy DM9 of the Local Plan which requires that proposals should not impact on the neighbouring amenity**

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED** given it conflicts with **Policy DM15 of the Local Plan which requires that new development is located away from areas of risk of flooding**

LOSS OF GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE

The Parish consider the expansion of the hardstanding will lead to an unacceptable loss of green infrastructure and adversely impact on the street scene as a result of a reduction in screening

PL348/24 - [EPF/2465/24](#) - 140, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 5DL

Proposed first floor rear extension, roof extension and front remodelling.

One MOP spoke in support

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL349/24 - [EPF/2225/24](#) - 38, Millwell Crescent, Chigwell, IG7 5HY

Double storey rear extension.

One MOP spoke in objection

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the following grounds:

LOSS OF LIGHT AND AMENITY TO NEIGHBOURING PROPERTY (NO 40)

It is considered the first floor extension is overbearing and will lead to a loss of amenity to neighbouring the neighbouring property

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED** given it conflicts with **Policy DM9 of the Local Plan which requires that proposals should not impact on the neighbouring amenity**

PL350/24 - [EPF/2511/24](#) - Rest Harrow, Millers Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6DG

Application for variation of condition 2 'plan no's' under EPF/0028/23 (and subsequent variation EPF/1288/23 allowed on appeal (Demolition of existing dwelling houses and garage building on the sites of No.1 and No. 2 Rest Harrow and erection of two new dwellinghouses.) - Minor amendment to the design. The overall height of the proposal has been increased by 1m so as to accommodate a bedroom within the roof structure. All other aspects of the design remain as consented.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** on the following grounds

The proposal is inappropriate development in Green Belt. The Parish **NOTED** that at Appeal no: 3331218 whilst allowing the appeal regarding a variation on conditions to relocate the previously approved two new dwellings, the Planning Inspector considered the previously approval application of the erection of two dwellings to be inappropriate development in Green Belt due to the proposed development being materially larger than the dwelling houses they are to replace. The appeal was dismissed on the grounds that the appeal scheme would not result in material harm to the openness of the Green Belt when compared to the fallback position of the two new dwellings approved under EPF/0028/23.

The Inspector considered the fallback position was a material consideration of significant weight in this case, and in the overall Green Belt balance when dismissing the appeal. The Inspector imposed a condition removing permitted development rights to ensure the acceptability of the scheme in terms of Green Belt.

Given the Inspector's comments, the Parish consider the proposed increase in height is considered inappropriate development that will adversely impact on the openness of the Green Belt. Given that the dwellings proposed would be larger than those they are to replace, the proposed development would, in both spatial and visual terms, lead to a further loss of openness.

The Parish consider the application should be **REFUSED given it conflicts with Policy DM4 of the Local Plan which requires that proposals should not adversely impact on openness and function of the Green Belt**

PL351/24 - [EPF/2394/24](#) - Chigwell School, 133 High Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QF

Demolition of three existing buildings and the addition of a new two storey teaching building and WC block.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the following grounds:

It was **NOTED** one of the buildings proposed for demolition appears to fall within the original curtilage of a listed building and as such should be considered listed. The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate treatment of a listed building. 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

PL352/24 - [EPF/2404/24](#) - 189, Oak Cottage, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 5AS

Demolition of outbuilding and rear chimney stack, erection of part single, part two-storey rear extensions, modification and enlargement of existing single storey side extensions, restoration of roof and chimney stack, internal modifications and refurbishment.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to on the grounds the proposal is a disproportionate extension to the host building. The Parish consider the proposal will cause significant harm to the listed building and its setting

PL353/24 - [EPF/2405/24](#) - 189, Oak Cottage, High Road, Chigwell, IG7 5AS

Grade II listed building application for demolition of outbuilding and rear chimney stack, erection of part single, part two-storey rear extensions, modification and enlargement of existing single storey side extensions, restoration of roof and chimney stack, internal modifications and refurbishment.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate treatment of a listed building. 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

PL354/24 - [EPF/2370/24](#) - 57, Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5JA

Erection of single storey rear extension 6.0m deep and Loft conversion into habitable space incorporating Rear Dormer and Side hip to gable wall extension with front slope Velux lights

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds the proposal is overbearing and of poor design

PL355/24 - [EPF/2371/24](#) - 57, Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell, IG7 5JA

Removal of existing Oak tree and extension of existing outbuilding for ancillary use.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds the proposal fails to demonstrate that neighbouring trees will not be adversely impacted. The feasibility of the proposal in relation to trees needs to be demonstrated. Lack of the necessary information is grounds for refusal. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection

PL356/24 - [EPF/2379/24](#) - 1, Gravel Close, Chigwell, IG7 6BZ

Single storey first floor side extension and front porch

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds the boundary treatment and electric gates are not in keeping with the street scene

PL357/24 - [EPF/2400/24](#) - 46A, Dickens Rise, Chigwell, IG7 6NY

Proposed full garage conversion, part rear infill extension with flat roof and roof lantern.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL358/24 - [EPF/2418/24](#) - 15, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RG

Proposed roof extension.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish **NOTED** the protected tree within curtilage. The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds the proposal fails to demonstrate that neighbouring trees will not be adversely impacted. The feasibility of the proposal in relation to trees needs to be demonstrated. Lack of the necessary information is grounds for refusal. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection

PL359/24 - [EPF/2437/24](#) - 25, Stradbroke Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RB

Rear & side extensions with flat roof to Ground Floor including a traditional rooflight at rear, Side & front extensions to First Floor, Erection of a new porch to the front (north), A new balcony over the porch, Modification of the roof and addition of dormer windows to front (north), side (west) & rear (south), Change of external finishes and modification of windows arrangement, Internal alterations.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL360/24 - [EPF/2439/24](#) - 8, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RF

Dormer to front

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds of poor design, an overly bulky appearance and damaging to the host building

PL361/24 - [EPF/2384/24](#) - 4, Chigwell Park Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5BD

Reinstate the pre-existing house

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL362/24 - [EPF/2449/24](#) - 87, Turpins Lane, Chigwell, IG8 8BA

Construction of a summer house with a sauna in the rear garden.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection although the Parish request any approval is conditional on the use remaining incidental to the main dwelling and no overnight accommodation or independent use is permitted

PL363/24 - [EPF/2055/24](#) - 149, Lambourne Road, Chigwell, IG7 6EJ

The conversion of a dwellinghouse into three flats with the provision of three parking spaces as well refuse and cycle storage.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL364/24 - [EPF/2312/24](#) - Verviers, 30 Tomswood Road, Chigwell, IG7 5QS

Demolition of existing single storey garden room. Erection of new garden room with basement and outdoor LED screen.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish **NOTED** the protected tree within curtilage and the absence of a basement impact assessment. The Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds the feasibility of the proposal in relation to trees and the basement impact needs to be demonstrated. Lack of the necessary information is grounds for refusal. If, however, all relevant Officers deem this application acceptable, whether with amendments or not, then the council is willing to waive this objection

PL365/24 - [EPF/2539/24](#) - 8, Parklands, Chigwell, IG7 6LW

Proposed basement accommodation to rear and a 2 storey rear extension (full width) including alterations and extension to roof.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds of poor design, an overly bulky appearance and damaging to the host building.

PL366/24 - [EPF/2540/24](#) - 1, Great Owl Road, Chigwell, IG7 6AL

Conversion of garage into habitable room, two storey front extension. single storey rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormer and front skylights.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Parish Council **OBJECTS** on the grounds of overdevelopment, size, poor design and an overly bulky appearance, the cumulative effects of which are considered damaging to the host building and the local amenity.

PL367/24 - [EPF/2516/24](#) - 186A Manor Road, Chigwell, IG7 5PZ

Prior approval for Change of Use of first and second floor from Class E (Office) to Class C3 (1(no.) x 2 Bedroom Flat. Ground Floor will remain as Class E (office)

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

NO OBJECTION although the committee noted a concern regarding access and parking and the possible adverse impact on on-street parking. The Council further **NOTED** with disappointment the

absence of a Refurbishments and Extensions Sustainability Checklist and noted the proposal may not adequately comply with Policy DM9 A (iii) (sustainable design and construction), DM19 (sustainable water) and/or DM20 (the incorporation of low carbon and renewable energy measures) and/or fail to make sufficient contribution to meeting the EFDC objective of net zero by 2030 or 2050

PL368/24 - [EPF/2559/24](#) - 4, Manor Road, Chigwell, IG7 5PD

Single storey extension to front of the garage.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

No Objection

PL369/24 - [EPF/2517/24](#) - The Rectory All Saints, Romford Road, Chigwell, IG7 4QD

TPO/EPF/28/82 (Ref: T37, T38)

T1 & T2: Lime - Crown reduce height, as specified. Reduce lateral branches to previous points, as specified

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate treatment or felling of a protected tree. 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

PL370/24 - [EPF/2409/24](#) - 43, Stradbroke Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RA

TPO/EPF/17/09

T15: Hornbeam - Selective reduction of two lower limbs, to clear building, as specified.

Chigwell Parish Council comment:

The Council **OBJECTS** to applications which may result in inappropriate treatment or felling of a protected tree. 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

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, the following Approval of Details Reserved by A Condition.

PL371/24 - [EPF/2525/24](#) - Derwen, Vicarage Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6LS

Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4'Foul and Surface Water' on planning permission EPF/2209/24 (Proposed outbuilding in rear garden).

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Comment

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, the following Prior Notification Applications

PL372/24 - NONE

To **NOTE** and **COMMENT** if appropriate, the following Lawful Development Applications

PL373/24 - [EPF/2415/24](#) - 16, Tudor Close, Chigwell, IG7 5BG

Certificate of lawful development for a proposed replacement single storey side extension.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Comment

PL374/24 - [EPF/2334/24](#) - 211, Fencepiece Road, Chigwell, IG7 5EB

Certificate of lawful development for a proposed change of use C3(a) to C3(b).

Chigwell Parish Council:

Class C3 (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order as amended refers to “use as a dwelling house by not more than six residents living together as a single household, (including a household where care is provided for residents).”

In the North Devon District Council [2003] case Justice Collins made the point that that children “need to be looked after. They cannot run a house. They cannot be expected to deal with all the matters that go to running a home ... children are regarded as needing full- time care from an adult, someone to look after them, someone to run their lives for them and someone to make sure that the household operates as it should.”

The North Devon judgement confirms that it is unrealistic to expect children to look after themselves in a single household. It also clarified that carers who provided 24 hour care but were not resident could not be regarded as living together in a household. The concept of living together as a household means that a proper functioning household must exist and children and carer must reside in the premises. A children’s home run on shift patterns could not be considered to fall within Class C3 (a) or Class C3 (b) because clearly, this is not occupation of a dwelling house by a single person or people living together as a family.

No information has been provided about the number of children who would be housed in the property, whether any staff are employed, how many adult carers would occupy the property, whether any would be permanently on site and/or the shift patterns of the carers.

Children’s homes based on shift patterns would not be considered to fall into either of these criteria. Following an assessment of case law and an Inspector’s decision of 2010 at Stockport, use of premises as a children’s home will generally be held to fall within Class C2 of the Order (Residential institutions).

As such the Parish Council consider the proposal not lawful

PL375/24 - [EPF/2491/24](#) - 33, Millwell Crescent, Chigwell, IG7 5HX

Certificate of Lawful Development for proposed loft conversion.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No comment

APPEALS

To consider and **AGREE** the Council's response/further action

PL376/24 - [EPF/1052/24](#) - APP/J1535/D/24/[3356509](#) - 1, Great Owl Road, Chigwell, IG7 6AL

Addition of basement, fenestration, and internal lift, to the Approved planning application ref [EPF/0377/24](#) (Conversion of garage into habitable room, two storey front extension. two storey rear extension part single storey rear extension, loft conversion

The Parish's objections remain

PL377/24 - ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE NEXT MEETING OR ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A DECISION TO BE MADE

PL378/24 - DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Thursday 23 January at 6.30pm

PL379/24 - EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

Members **CONSIDERED** whether the public interest in maintaining confidentiality may outweigh the public interest in the item being made public and **AGREED** the following motion proposed by the Chair:

"That the public and the press be excluded from the meeting, the Council believing that publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest by reason of the confidential nature of the business about to be discussed."

PL380/24 - LEGAL MATTERS

Members heard an update from the Chair in regard to legal advice received on the recent planning decisions at Froghall Lane (EPF/0942/24) and Chigwell Primary (EPF/2704/23) (Appendix 9) and **AGREE** the appropriate course of action as recommended by advisors

The meeting closed at 8.08pm