Chigwell PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE**
**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Date: Thursday 12 November 2026
Time: 6.00pm
Location: Victory Hall, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QX

Members present:

Cllr. Elliot Costa (Chair)
#Cllr Tosin Amuludun
Cllr Lisa Morgan-Skingsley
#Cllr Faiza Rivzi
#Cllr Celina Jefcoate (Vice Chair)
Cllr Lorraine Clarke
Cllr Debby Rye

Clerk to the Council and Proper Officer: Jason Selvarajah MSc

## 1. PL188/25 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and **ACCEPTED** from Cllr. Osman Ali, Cllr Erika Skingsley, Cllr Jamie Braha

## 2. PL189/25 - OTHER ABSENCES

None

## 3. PL190/25 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs Rizvi and Jefcoate declared a prejudicial interest in planning application EPF/0729/26 - Land East of Hainault Road, Chigwell as they reside in close proximity to the application site. The councillors withdrew from the meeting for the duration of the item and took no part in the discussion or vote.

Cllr Jefcoate declared a non-prejudicial interest in planning application EPF/1977/26 - Forest House, Vicarage Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6NA as the applicant is known to them. The councillor confirmed that this would not affect their impartiality and remained in the meeting

## 4. PL191/25 - MINUTES

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 October 2026 **(APPENDIX 1)** be approved as a true and accurate record and signed by the Chair.

## 5. PL192/25 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There were 58 members of the public in attendance. Members **NOTED** the representations made by 10 members of the public with regard to item 6 (Land East of Hainault Road, Chigwell) and one member of the public with regard to Item 21 (15, Westmede, Chigwell, IG7 5LR)

Members **CONSIDERED** the following applications received for the weeks ending 16, 23 and 30 October 2026

#Cllrs Jefcoate and Rizvi left the meeting

**6. PL193/25 - EPF/0729/26 - Land East of Hainault Road, Chigwell**

Outline Application (all matters reserved except means of access) for housing led mixed use development (12.6 hectares net developed area) comprising: up to 250 Units (50% Affordable) (CLASS C3); commercial (CLASS E [C], [E], [F], [G][I]) development [commercial floorspace/primary healthcare up to ,500M2, day nursery up to 1,000M2, excluding parking and associated land, care/ retirement living [CLASS C2] approximately 60 to 70 bed/up to 7,000M2]; New accessible green space (26.42HA) for informal leisure and Biodiversity Net Gain; together with a new all-purpose access from Hainault Road and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

There were 56 members of the public in attendance. Members **NOTED** the representations made by 10 members of the public against the item

Members **NOTED** the Officer Report (**APPENDIX 2**) and that the site is in Green Belt

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to application EPF/0729/26 and requests that Epping Forest District Council refuse outline planning permission.

The Parish Council considers that the proposal is unacceptable in principle. It would introduce substantial urban development into a strategically important area of Metropolitan Green Belt, permanently advance the built-up edge of Chigwell into open countryside and weaken the protection of the remaining Green Belt.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the land qualifies as grey belt, that the proposal meets an alternative exception to national Green Belt policy, or that very special circumstances exist to justify inappropriate development.

**Inappropriate development in the Green Belt - failure to demonstrate very special circumstances**

The application proposes substantial residential, commercial, nursery and care development on open farmland within the designated Metropolitan Green Belt. The land is not allocated for development in the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan.

NPPF Policy GB6(1) establishes that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless it falls within one of the categories specified in Policy GB7.

Policy GB6(2) states "Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances."

It further requires that Green Belt harm, together with any other harm, must be clearly outweighed by other considerations and that substantial weight must be given to Green Belt harm, including harm to openness.

The proposed development does not fall within the conventional exceptions for agricultural development, limited village infilling, rural affordable housing exception sites or the redevelopment of previously developed land.

The Parish Council also rejects the applicant's argument that the land qualifies as grey belt under Policy GB7(1)(g), for the reasons set out below.

The application would introduce up to 250 dwellings and substantial additional buildings into open countryside. The resulting harm to openness would be both spatial and visual. It would replace open agricultural land with built development, roads, parking, lighting and associated urban activity.

The harm would be permanent and could not be removed through landscaping or the retention of adjoining fields as open space.

The Parish Council considers that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt and that the applicant has failed to demonstrate very special circumstances sufficient to justify it.

The development is therefore contrary to the fundamental objectives of national Green Belt policy and the protection afforded by Local Plan Policies SP5 and DM4.

**Failure to establish that the site is grey belt**

The Parish Council strongly disputes the applicant's classification of the application site as grey belt.

The relevant land was assessed by EFDC in its 2016 Green Belt Stage 2 Assessment. Parcels DSR-035.5 and DSR-035.6 were identified as making a Strong contribution to preventing urban sprawl, preventing settlements from merging and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The assessment identified Very High harm arising from release of the land from the Green Belt.

These findings are directly relevant to the present application. They establish that the land performs important Green Belt functions and that its development would have consequences extending beyond the immediate building footprint.

The applicant's assessment reaches a substantially different conclusion without convincingly explaining why the Council's earlier findings should now be disregarded.

In particular, the applicant has placed excessive emphasis on the western development area and its proximity to existing housing, without adequately considering its connection to the wider Green Belt or the strategic consequences of extending the settlement eastwards.

The site is not substantially enclosed by urban development. The Courtland Estate forms part of the northern boundary and existing development lies to the west. However, the southern boundary comprises the Central Line railway and its substantial vegetation belt, while the eastern land remains connected to extensive open countryside.

The proposal would therefore not fill an isolated gap within an established built-up area. It would extend the urban edge into previously undeveloped Green Belt.

The Parish Council considers that the applicant's grey-belt assessment understates the land's contribution to checking sprawl and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.

The applicant has consequently failed to establish that the development satisfies the first requirement of NPPF Policy GB7(1)(g).

**Unacceptable urban sprawl and weakening of the Metropolitan Green Belt**

Chigwell's Green Belt performs a particularly important strategic function because of its location adjoining the London Borough of Redbridge and the Greater London urban area.

It helps maintain the distinction between Chigwell, the wider Essex countryside and London's outward expansion.

The proposal would create a substantial finger of development extending eastwards from the existing settlement into open farmland closer to the boundary with Redbridge. The consequence would not simply be the loss of the fields occupied by buildings. It would establish an entirely new built-up edge further into the Green Belt and close to London.

This is especially significant because the Green Belt's purpose is not merely to preserve attractive views or provide recreational land. Its fundamental purpose is to prevent urban sprawl by maintaining the openness and permanence of land.

Annex E of the 2026 NPPF expressly identifies the characteristics of extended fingers of development as relevant when assessing contributions to preventing urban sprawl. The proposed development would display those characteristics.

The existing railway and vegetation corridor provide a substantial and recognisable physical boundary. The new eastern edge would instead rely to a considerable extent on hedgerows, field boundaries and landscaping. Such features would provide a less robust and defensible long-term boundary and would leave the remaining Green Belt more vulnerable to further encroachment.

The Parish Council considers that the development would undermine the strategic function of this part of the Green Belt and create a harmful precedent for further outward expansion. This harm cannot be assessed solely by reference to the 12.6 hectares proposed for development or the allowance for green space within the site. The consequences for the surrounding Green Belt must also be considered.

The proposal conflicts with the Green Belt purposes identified in national policy and with Local Plan Policies SP5 and DM4.

**Affordable housing does not justify the Green Belt harm**

The applicant proposes 50% affordable housing and presents this as an important benefit of the scheme. The Parish Council recognises the need for affordable housing and accepts that its provision is a material planning consideration. However, Policy H2 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan already requires 40% affordable housing for developments of this size.

The proposed 50% therefore represents an additional 10 percentage points above the adopted local requirement. Furthermore, NPPF Policy GB8 requires certain major housing developments

on Green Belt land to provide an enhanced affordable housing contribution. Where the relevant local policy has not been updated for that purpose, the national requirement is generally 15 percentage points above the existing requirement, subject to a 50% cap.

Accordingly, the applicant's 50% provision corresponds to the capped national Golden Rules contribution rather than representing an exceptional offer beyond that requirement.

The Parish Council considers that compliance with an applicable affordable housing requirement cannot, by itself, establish that inappropriate Green Belt development should be permitted.

The Golden Rules do not override the separate tests governing whether land qualifies as grey belt or whether development satisfies an exception under Policy GB7. Nor do they eliminate the requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances where development remains inappropriate.

The applicant has not shown why the additional affordable housing could only be delivered on this particular site or why its benefits should clearly outweigh the substantial and permanent harm arising from development of a strategically important part of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

The proposed public open space and biodiversity improvements are also acknowledged. However, retaining the eastern land as open space does not compensate for the permanent urbanisation of the western farmland. The loss of openness, the eastward movement of the built-up boundary and the weakening of the surrounding Green Belt would remain.

When the Green Belt harm is considered alongside landscape impacts, traffic congestion, inadequate sustainable transport and unresolved infrastructure concerns, the Parish Council considers that the benefits of the proposal do not demonstrate very special circumstances.

The Parish Council therefore rejects the proposition that 50% affordable housing provides sufficient justification for development on this site.

**Failure to satisfy the national Green Belt exceptions**

Even if the applicant were able to establish that part of the site qualifies as grey belt, that would not automatically make the development acceptable. NPPF Policy GB7(1)(g) imposes four cumulative conditions. These concern the grey-belt status and effect on the remaining Green Belt, evidenced unmet need, sustainable location and compliance with the Golden Rules.

The Parish Council considers that the applicant has not convincingly demonstrated compliance with these requirements. Its assessment of the land's Green Belt contribution is disputed, the site has limited sustainable transport choices and the applicant's own highway modelling predicts that important junctions would reach capacity. Concerns also remain about school places, community infrastructure and the adequacy of environmental and visual impact evidence.

The applicant must demonstrate that the development, taken as a whole, meets the relevant requirements, rather than relying on individual benefits while leaving other conditions unresolved.

The alternative exception under Policy GB7(1)(h) for residential or mixed-use development near a well-connected station is also not established. Although Chigwell Underground station is within walking distance, its location on the Central Line loop and the frequency and connectivity of services must be assessed against the NPPF definition of a well-connected station. Proximity alone is insufficient.

That exception also requires the proposal to be physically well-related to the station or settlement, to be of a scale that available or proposed infrastructure can accommodate, not to prejudice long-term comprehensive development and to comply with the Golden Rules for major development.

The applicant has not convincingly established those requirements, particularly given its own forecasts of highway capacity problems and the outstanding questions about education and other infrastructure. The Parish Council considers that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the development is not inappropriate under either Policy GB7(1)(g) or Policy GB7(1)(h).

**Landscape and visual harm**

The development would permanently urbanise an attractive, undulating area of farmland within Landscape Character Area G3 - Chigwell, part of the Wooded Ridges and Valleys landscape identified in EFDC's 2010 Landscape Character Assessment.

The Council's landscape guidance recognises the importance of open arable fields, mature hedgerows, tranquillity and characteristic countryside views. It recommends that any new development within the farmland should be small-scale, respect the historic settlement pattern and maintain characteristic views. The proposed 250 homes and substantial additional buildings are fundamentally at odds with those objectives.

The Parish Council considers that the Landscape and Visual Assessment prepared by Influence is not representative and materially understates the likely harm.

No views were recorded from public rights of way Chigwell 77 and 78, despite their close relationship with the proposed development. The assessment also fails to demonstrate convincingly the effects from the wider footpath network, elevated countryside, Vicarage Lane, Courtland Drive, Meadow Way and Daleside Gardens.

Influence relies heavily on existing vegetation and proposed planting to minimise the apparent impact. This does not adequately reflect the site's undulating topography, the potential visibility of buildings above vegetation, winter conditions or the years required for planting to mature. Screening buildings does not remove the permanent loss of open countryside or the harm to Green Belt openness and landscape character.

The application seeks outline permission for up to 250 homes and substantial additional non-residential floorspace. The Parish Council is not satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated the visual effects of the maximum amount of development for which permission is sought. These are fundamental consequences of the location, scale and amount of development. They cannot simply be assumed to be resolved through later decisions on design and landscaping.

The proposal would cause significant harm to landscape character and visual amenity, contrary to Local Plan Policies SP6 and DM3.

**Public rights of way and loss of rural amenity**

The proposal would substantially harm the setting and enjoyment of public footpaths Chigwell 73, 77 and 78. These routes are valued because they pass through open countryside, providing rural views, wildlife and tranquillity.

Walking through open fields is not the same as walking through or around a housing estate. Retaining or improving the paths or providing new routes alongside houses and roads does not compensate for the permanent loss of their countryside setting.

The applicant has failed to give sufficient weight to this harm, which arises directly from the proposed urbanisation of the land.

**Traffic congestion and highway capacity**

The applicant's Transport Assessment forecasts 257 vehicle movements during the morning peak hour and 244 during the evening peak.

Its modelling predicts that the Hainault Road/High Road mini-roundabout would reach capacity, with the morning queue on Hainault Road increasing from approximately 7 to 16.5 passenger car units. The nearby High Road/Chigwell Rise mini-roundabout is also predicted to reach capacity during peak periods. Despite its forecasts showing junctions at capacity and substantially longer queues, the applicant proposes no meaningful highway improvements.

The traffic surveys were undertaken on a single day, 11 November 2025, and the original models were subsequently adjusted against those observations. The limited survey evidence and assumptions do not provide sufficient reassurance where the predicted junctions have little or no spare capacity.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate convincingly that the local highway network can accommodate the combined traffic generated by the housing, nursery, commercial and care uses without unacceptable additional congestion and delay. The Parish Council considers that the proposal has not demonstrated acceptable highway impacts, contrary to the objectives of Local Plan Policy T1 and national transport policy.

**Unsustainable transport provision**

The applicant has significantly overstated the site's accessibility by sustainable transport. There is only one regular bus service serving the immediate area, the 167. The 667 and 677 services identified in the Travel Plan are school services only, while the regular 462 stops approximately one kilometre from the proposed residential area.

The applicant's own Travel Plan acknowledges that the identified nearby bus stops are beyond the recommended 400 metre walking catchment and that there are no designated cycle routes in the immediate vicinity.

Chigwell Underground station is within walking distance but is on the Central Line loop, with limited direct services into central London and many journeys requiring a change of train. It is also one of the least-used stations on the Underground network.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that existing public transport and cycling infrastructure would provide realistic alternatives to private vehicles for development of this scale. Travel packs, vouchers and promotional measures do not create additional bus services, cycle routes or improved rail connections. The development would remain substantially car-dependent, adding to the traffic pressures identified above.

The deficiencies in sustainable transport are also relevant to the Green Belt exceptions under Policy GB7.

**Epping Forest SAC - inadequate evidence for the statutory assessment**

EFDC's own Habitats Regulations Assessment consultant concluded that the applicant's traffic evidence was not sufficiently robust to enable assessment of the potential atmospheric-pollution effects on Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation.

The shortcomings identified included traffic data collected during Covid restrictions, missing daily vehicle and heavy-goods vehicle figures, inadequate traffic-distribution assumptions and insufficient consideration of the different commercial uses proposed.

These deficiencies raise serious questions about the reliability of the applicant's traffic assessment and its conclusions concerning potential effects on the protected site.

On the evidence reviewed, the applicant has failed to provide the information necessary for EFDC to complete a satisfactory Habitats Regulations Assessment and establish that the development would not adversely affect the integrity of Epping Forest SAC.

This is a fundamental statutory matter which cannot simply be deferred until after outline permission. Unless the outstanding deficiencies have been resolved, permission cannot lawfully be granted without the necessary conclusions under the Habitats Regulations.

**Education and community infrastructure**

The applicant estimates that the development would generate approximately 110 school-age children. Its Community Infrastructure Report records West Hatch High School operating above its stated capacity in 2024/25. The applicant suggests that independent schools, including Chigwell School, may accommodate some of the additional pupils. This is unsupported and cannot substitute for demonstrating adequate state-school provision, particularly when half the proposed homes would be affordable housing.

The applicant has failed to establish that sufficient state-school places would be available when the development is occupied or that necessary additional provision would be funded and delivered.

The same concern applies to wider community infrastructure. The possibility that proposed commercial floorspace could accommodate healthcare services is not a commitment to provide a GP surgery. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the necessary education, healthcare and transport infrastructure can support the full development proposed.

These shortcomings are particularly relevant to NPPF Policies GB7 and GB8, which require consideration of infrastructure capacity and necessary improvements.

**Potential harm to Chigwell Village Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings**

The proposed development is situated near Chigwell Village Conservation Area and a group of Grade II listed buildings on Hainault Road, including Elces at No. 40 and the historic cottages at Nos. 44–54.

These historic buildings and the wider village form an important part of Chigwell's character. The introduction of up to 250 dwellings, substantial additional buildings, new roads and urban activity into adjoining countryside has the potential to alter the setting in which these heritage assets are experienced, particularly along Hainault Road and the approaches to the historic village.

Although the development site is outside the Conservation Area, this does not mean that its effects on the setting of the Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings can be disregarded. The

relationship between the historic settlement and the surrounding countryside is an important consideration.

The Parish Council is concerned that the scale of the proposed development could harm the setting and significance of these heritage assets. It requests that EFDC give particular scrutiny to the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment, including the impact of the maximum development proposed, changes to historic approaches and the cumulative effects of buildings, roads, lighting and traffic.

The Parish Council considers that the potential harm to the historic environment must be properly established and weighed in the planning balance, in accordance with Local Plan Policy DM7 and national heritage policy.

**Failure to assess the maximum development sought**

The application seeks outline permission for up to 250 dwellings and substantial additional non-residential floorspace. The applicant has not convincingly demonstrated that the combined landscape, transport and infrastructure effects of the maximum amount of development have been assessed.

Nor has it demonstrated that its traffic and environmental assessments adequately reflect the full range and maximum scale of commercial, nursery and care uses for which permission is sought.

The applicant must establish that the development proposed is acceptable in principle at this stage. Fundamental consequences of its location, scale and nature cannot simply be left to reserved matters.

The Parish Council considers that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the full development sought is acceptable.

**Ecology, biodiversity and drainage**

The applicant's ecological evidence confirms the loss of existing arable land, grassland and scrub within the western development area and increased artificial lighting and activity near established wildlife corridors. Further bat-roost surveys remain identified in the ecological assessment, and inconsistencies exist between the site areas and open-space figures in the ecological documents and the application.

The applicant has not consistently demonstrated that the claimed biodiversity outcomes relate to the full development now proposed.

Although biodiversity improvements are proposed on the eastern land, these do not remove the permanent landscape harm or automatically compensate for the loss and urbanisation of the western countryside.

The site also includes sloping land, lower-lying areas and watercourses associated with Chigwell Brook. The Flood Risk Assessment recognises surface-water flooding risks but leaves detailed hydraulic and drainage-network modelling to later stages. The applicant has not fully demonstrated how the maximum development sought would affect surface-water runoff, drainage capacity and flood risk to neighbouring and downstream properties.

These matters add to the Parish Council's concerns about the adequacy of the evidence supporting the proposed amount and location of development.

**Overall objection**

The proposal would cause substantial and permanent harm to a strategically important part of the Metropolitan Green Belt, creating a substantial finger of urban development extending into open countryside and weakening the protection of the remaining Green Belt bordering Greater London.

EFDC's own Green Belt evidence identified the relevant land as making a Strong contribution to Green Belt purposes and assessed the harm from its release as Very High.

The applicant has failed to provide a convincing justification for departing from those conclusions or for classifying the land as grey belt.

The Parish Council considers that the development is inappropriate under NPPF Policy GB6, that compliance with the exceptions in Policy GB7 has not been demonstrated and that very special circumstances sufficient to outweigh the substantial Green Belt harm have not been established.

The proposed 50% affordable housing and additional public open space are acknowledged as benefits, but 40% affordable housing is already required by the adopted Local Plan and the 50% contribution corresponds to the capped national Golden Rules requirement.

The provision of affordable housing does not override Green Belt policy or justify the permanent loss of land that performs an important strategic function in preventing urban sprawl.

Significant concerns also remain about landscape and visual harm, traffic congestion, sustainable transport, education, community infrastructure and the adequacy of the environmental evidence.

EFDC's own consultant has identified deficiencies in the information required to assess potential effects on Epping Forest SAC.

These objections concern the principle, location and scale of development. They are not matters that can simply be resolved through reserved matters, additional landscaping or planning conditions.

Chigwell Parish Council therefore **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to application EPF/0729/26 and requests that Epping Forest District Council refuse outline planning permission. The Parish requests an invitation to make representations should this matter be considered by at Committee level

#Cllrs Jefcoate and Rizvi rejoined the meeting

**7. PL194/25 - EPF/2039/26 - Old Loughtonians Hockey Club, Luxborough Lane, Chigwell, IG7 5AB**

Erection of steel-framed building to provide multi-purpose sports training facility, ancillary equipment storage and complementary sporting uses in connection with the Old Loughtonians Hockey Club, and the development approved under application reference EPF/0687/24, as amended by Section 73 Application reference EPF/1427/26.

Members noted the site is in Green Belt and the Officer Report (**APPENDIX 3**)

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** to the application.

The Parish Council notes the previous permissions for four covered padel courts and a clubhouse. The current application proposes a further substantial enclosed building in a separate part of the Green Belt site. The Council remains concerned about the cumulative impact on openness and compliance with Policy DM4 and national Green Belt policy.

The Parish Council also objects on parking grounds. The original padel development formalised an existing hockey club overflow parking area into 68 spaces for shared use. The subsequent transport assessment estimated that padel users could occupy up to 50 of these spaces, leaving 18 for hockey overflow parking.

The Essex Parking Guidance (2024) specifies one space per 20m² of public area for indoor sports halls. No additional parking is proposed, and the submitted information does not demonstrate that existing provision can accommodate the combined demand from the hockey club, padel courts and proposed sports hall. Compliance with the Essex Parking Standards and Local Plan Policy T1 has not been established.

The Parish Council also has concerns about the additional traffic impact on Epping Forest SAC, the proximity of the building to Chigwell Brook under Policy DM17 and the contradictory flood-risk information in the drainage consultation response.

For these reasons, the Parish Council objects to the application as submitted

**8. PL195/25 - EPF/1857/26 - 1, Lambourne Crescent, Chigwell, IG7 6EY**

Construction of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

**9. PL196/25 - EPF/1875/26 - 40A, Copperfield Lodge, Hainault Road, Chigwell, IG7 6QX**

Single Storey Conservatory Style Side Extension.

Members noted the Officer Advisory, namely the proposed single-storey side extension appears reasonable in terms of its design and relationship with the existing property. However, EFDC's Trees officer has objected due to concerns about the protection of trees, including those subject to Tree Preservation Orders. Members took into account of these concerns under Policy DM5, particularly the potential impact of foundations and construction works on tree roots, before deciding whether to support the application.

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application on grounds of the potential impact on protected trees, including those subject to Tree Preservation Orders, in accordance with Policy DM5. Members support EFDC's Trees Officer's objection and are concerned about possible damage to tree roots from foundations and construction works. Members also noted that no street scene drawing has been provided to demonstrate how the extension would relate to its surroundings.

**#**Cllr Amuluden joined the meeting at 6.30pm

**10. PL197/25 - EPF/1904/26 - 29, Ely Place, Chigwell, IG8 8AG**

Proposed first floor extension to rear including roof light in new roof.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

**11. PL198/25 - EPF/1918/26 - 88, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RD**

Front, rear and side extensions and new front boundary wall and gates.

Members NOTED the Officer Advisory, namely the comments made by EFDC's Trees Officer when they considered this application, particularly any outstanding concerns about the protection of existing trees and the adequacy of the submitted arboricultural information. These matters are relevant to Local Plan Policy DM5 and should be taken into account when reaching a decision.

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application due to concerns regarding the protection of existing trees and the adequacy of the submitted arboricultural information, in accordance with Policy DM5. Members also raised concerns about the sustainability of the proposed development given the large amount of glass and lack of shading and noted that no street scene drawing has been provided to demonstrate its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

**12. PL199/25 - EPF/1961/26 - 7 Stradbroke Park, Tomswood Road, Chigwell, IG7 5QL**

Proposed relocation of the existing rear garden boundary, erection of a reinforced concrete retaining wall with a 2.0m high timber fence above, and associated landscaping works to extend and improve the existing rear garden area.

Members noted the Officer report **(APPENDIX 4)**

Chigwell Parish Council:

The Council **OBJECTS** to the application on the grounds that the proposed retaining wall and 2m timber fence could create a boundary approximately 3.5m high when viewed from adjoining lower ground. The lack of confirmed ground levels and boundary heights makes it difficult to assess the visual impact and effect on neighbouring properties, particularly those in Copthorne Avenue, under Policy DM9.

The Parish Council also notes that the proposed boundary extends beyond the existing garden.

The drainage arrangements are indicative and do not adequately show how surface water would be managed without affecting adjoining properties, raising concerns under DM16.

The Parish Council considers that these matters have not been sufficiently addressed and therefore objects to the application as submitted

**13. PL200/25 - EPF/1988/26 - 5, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RG**

Hip to gable loft extension with front and rear dormer and new windows. Single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, raising of ground level of garage and driveway to match the existing house level. Replacement fenestration and conversion of existing cellar into basement storage area.

Members **NOTED** the Officer report **(APPENDIX 6)**

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application.

The proposal would substantially alter an existing two-bedroom bungalow, introducing approximately 54m² of habitable loft accommodation. The Parish Council is concerned that the extent of these alterations would undermine the retention of bungalow accommodation, contrary to the objectives of Policy H1(E).

The proposed hip-to-gable conversion and substantial front dormer would also significantly alter the roofline and character of the dwelling. The scale and appearance of the roof extension would be particularly prominent within the street scene and unsympathetic to the adjoining semi-detached property at No. 3, contrary to Policy DM9.

The Parish Council therefore objects to the proposal on the grounds of its impact on the character of the existing bungalow and surrounding area and loss of a bungalow

**14. PL201/25 - EPF/1975/26 - 33, St Marys Way, Chigwell, IG7 5BX**

Installation of air source heat pump.

Chigwell Parish Council:

No Objection

**15. PL202/25 - EPF/1977/26 - Forest House, Vicarage Lane, Chigwell, IG7 6NA**

TPO/EPF/17/91 (Ref: T40, T41)
T6: Lime - Crown reduce by up to 2m, as specified. Crown lift by up to 4m from ground, as specified.
T7: Yew - Reduce weight out of top south overhanging corner and shape, as specified.

T8 - TPO-T8 - Black Locust - Dead tree - Fell

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

**16. PL203/25 - EPF/2015/26 - 58, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RD**

TPO/EPF/11/09 (Ref: T8)

T1: Oak – Crown reduce by up to 4m, as specified.

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

**17. PL204/25 - EPF/2018/26 - 15, Ely Place, Chigwell, IG8 8AG**

TPO/EPF/09/11 (Ref: T2)

T1: Oak - Remove damaged/diseased stem back to main trunk, as specified.

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

Members **NOTED** the following Approval of Details Reserved by A Condition

**18. PL205/25 - EPF/2003/26 - 78, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RD**

Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 8 Submit Tree Survey of EPF/0706/26 (New detached single-family dwelling to replace existing bungalow (Retrospective).

**19. PL206/25 - EPF/2012/26 - 112, Manor Road, Chigwell, IG7 5PW**

Approval of Details Reserved by Condition 4 Surface Water Drainage of EPF/1277/26 (Proposed part two-storey front and side extension, two-storey rear extension, basement, front porch, and roof extension incorporating a loft conversion with front and rear dormers).

**20. PL207/25 - EPF/2037/26 - Old Loughtonians Hockey Club, Luxborough Lane, Chigwell, IG7 5AB**

Approval of Details Reserved by Conditions 3 Cycle Parking, 4 Floodlighting Details, 5 Hard and Soft Landscaping and 7 EVP of EPF/1427/26 (Variation of Condition 2 Plan Numbers of EPF/0687/24 (Construction of a padel tennis facility)).

Members **NOTED** and **COMMENTED** as appropriate, the following Prior Approval Applications

**21. PL208/25 - EPF/1922/26 - 15, Westmede, Chigwell, IG7 5LR**

Single storey rear extension.

A member of the public spoke in objection

Chigwell Parish Council:

Chigwell Parish Council **OBJECTS** to the application. Members considered that the proposed full-width, 6-metre-deep rear extension, with a height of 3 metres, would be excessive for this narrow terraced property and could have an overbearing impact, causing loss of light and outlook to neighbouring properties at Nos. 13 and 17 Westmede. Members also noted concerns raised by a member of the public regarding overdevelopment and the potential loss of parking associated with the proposed demolition of the existing rear outbuilding.

**22. PL209/25 - EPF/1979/26 - 14, Grange Crescent, Chigwell, IG7 5JB**

6 meters rear extension.

Members **NOTED** the following Lawful Development Applications

**23. PL210/25 - EPF/1913/26 - 44A, Coopers Close, Chigwell, IG7 6EU**

Certificate of Lawful Development for existing use of land for parking and domestic storage ancillary to residential use.

**24. PL211/25 - EPF/1959/26 - 19, Globe Cottage, Lambourne Road, Chigwell, IG7 6HA**

Certificate of Lawfulness to confirm the lawful implementation of planning permission EPF/0834/22 by the carrying out of a material operation, namely the excavation of foundation trenches and pouring of foundations, commenced on 25th August 2026, before the expiry of the permission.

**APPEALS**

Members **NOTED** the following Householder Appeals. These appeals follow a fast-track process where interested parties and statutory consultees are not allowed to make fresh representations or add new comments once the appeal has started.

The Planning Inspector will make their decision based on the existing file, including the original application documents, the local planning authority's refusal reasons and whatever the parish council or local residents submitted the first time around.

**25. PL212/25 - EPF/1052/26 - AP-13739 - 62, Bracken Drive, Chigwell, IG7 5RD**

Variation of Condition 2 Plan Numbers of EPF/1144/25 (Demolition of existing house and erection of a new bungalow, incorporating pitched roof and dormers).

**26. PL213/25 - EPF/0664/26 - AP-13725 - 32, Clayside, Chigwell, IG7 5LN**

Erection of two storey side extension and alterations to roof including installation of solar panels.

To consider and **AGREE** the Council's response/further action to the following Planning Appeals with Written Representation

**27. PL214/25 - EPF/0636/26 - AP-13727 - 247, Fencepiece Road, Chigwell, IG7 5DX - Appeal ref: 6017239**

Demolition of 6 existing garages and 1 existing dwelling at 247 Fencepiece Road, and replacement with 8 dwellings together with parking, landscaping and all associated works.

Written Representations due by: 19 November 2026

Members **AGREED** that Chigwell Parish Council delegates authority to officers to submit representations to the Planning Inspectorate by 19 November 2026 supporting the Local Planning Authority's decision and requesting that the appeal is dismissed.

**28. PL215/25 - EPF/0673/26 - AP-13734 - Land And Garages On The North Side Of, Shrublands Close, Chigwell, IG7 5EA - 6017246**

Demolition of existing garage structures and the construction of 6 new residential dwellings, together with associated landscaping, vehicular and cycle parking, private amenity spaces, refuse/ recycling facilities, and all other associated site works.

Written Representations due by: TBA

Members **AGREED** that Chigwell Parish Council delegates authority to officers to submit representations to the Planning Inspectorate by 19 November 2026 supporting the Local Planning Authority's decision and requesting that the appeal is dismissed.

**29. PL216/25 - APPEALS DECIDED**

Members **NOTED** the following decisions

**EPF/0344/26** - AP-13657 - 140, Bliss Heights, London Road, Lambourne, Romford, RM4 1XX -

Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of an ancillary residential accommodation (Use Class C3) incidental to the host dwelling at Bliss Heights **- APPEAL DISMISSED - APPENDIX 7**

**EPF/0225/26** - AP-13661 - Land adjacent to Jessica Chase Lane Chigwell Essex IG7 6JW

Partial demolition and extension of existing stable structure to provide facilities more suitable for non-profit organisation, Chigwell Trust. (Revised application to EPF/0350/25) **- APPEAL DISMISSED - APPENDIX 7**

**EPF/0350/25** - AP-13660 - Land adjacent to Jessica Chase Lane Chigwell Essex IG7 6JW

Partial demolition and extension of existing stable structure to provide facilities more suitable for non-profit organisation, Chigwell Trust **- APPEAL DISMISSED - APPENDIX 7**

**30. PL217/25 - ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A DECISION TO BE MADE OR ITEMS TO BE BROUGHT FORWARD TO THE NEXT MEETING**

**31. PL218/25 - DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

Agreed as Thursday 26 November at 6.00pm