

Supplementary Committee Agenda



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Area Planning Subcommittee East Monday, 1st July, 2013

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping

Time: 7.30 pm

Democratic Services: Simon Hill - The Office of the Chief Executive
Email: democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk Tel:
01992 564470

5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS (Pages 3 - 8)

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs (6) and (24) of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution requires that the permission of the Chairman be obtained, after prior notice to the Chief Executive, before urgent business not specified in the agenda (including a supplementary agenda of which the statutory period of notice has been given) may be transacted.

In accordance with Operational Standing Order 6 (non-executive bodies), any item raised by a non-member shall require the support of a member of the Committee concerned and the Chairman of that Committee. Two weeks' notice of non-urgent items is required.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

APPLICATION No:	EPF/0733/13
SITE ADDRESS:	34 Hartland Road Epping Essex CM16 4PE
PARISH:	Epping
WARD:	Epping Hemnall
APPLICANT:	Mr Bryan Welch
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:	Loft extension to create bedroom by raising the ridge level with front and rear dormer windows.
RECOMMENDED DECISION:	Grant Permission (With Conditions)

Click on the link below to view related plans and documents for this case:

http://planpub.eppingforestdc.gov.uk/AniteIM.websearch/ExternalEntryPoint.aspx?SEARCH_TYPE=1&DOC_CLASS_CODE=PL&FOLDER1_REF=548071

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.
- 2 Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed development, shall match those of the existing building, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
- 3 No development, including works of demolition or site clearance, shall take place until a Tree Protection Plan, Arboricultural Method Statement and site monitoring schedule in accordance with BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved documents unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.
- 4 All construction/demolition works and ancillary operations, including vehicle movement on site which are audible at the boundary of noise sensitive premises, shall only take place between the hours of 08.00 to 18.30 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturday, and at no time during Sundays and Public/Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This application is before this Committee since the recommendation is for approval contrary to an objection from a local council which is material to the planning merits of the proposal (Pursuant to The Constitution, Part Three: Planning Directorate – Delegation of Council function, Schedule 1, Appendix A.(g)) and since it is for a type of development that cannot be determined by Officers if

more than four objections material to the planning merits of the proposal to be approved are received (Pursuant to The Constitution, Part Three: Planning Directorate – Delegation of Council function, Schedule 1, Appendix A.(f).).

This application was deferred by the meeting of the 19th June to enable members to carry out a site visit, the original report is reproduced below.

Description of Site:

No34 Hartland Road is a detached dwelling which is half double, half single storey. The house has been extended in the roof and there are two dormer windows in the side roof planes of the main section of the dwelling, and a set of doors with a Juliette Balcony facing southwards. Hartland Road has a mix of dwelling styles but the dominant character is of large detached dwellings. The rear of the site backs on to a cul-de-sac of dwellings, Green Trees, and there is a fall in ground levels of approximately 2.0m from the application site to houses on this development. A heavy screen exists along the rear boundary of the site.

Description of Proposal:

The applicant seeks consent to raise the ridge level of a single storey section of the dwelling by 1.0m. This section of the house currently has a low ridged roof to the front and a flat section to the rear. Both areas would be built above to form a first floor. A dormer window would be inserted in the newly created front and rear roof slopes and a flat section of roof would join the rear dormer to an existing side facing dormer. The doors and Juliette Balcony would be removed and replaced by a window.

Relevant History:

CLD/EPF/2083/04 - Certificate of lawfulness for proposed loft conversion with side dormer windows. Lawful: 06/12/04.

EPF/1453/04 - Single storey front porch extension, single storey side extension conservatory and loft conversion with 1 dormer windows to southwest facing roof slope. Grant Permission with conditions - 29/11/2004.

EPF/2471/09 - Certificate of lawful development for a proposed erection of rear fence, raised deck area and front gates adjacent to 'Warslin Lea'. (Revised application). Lawful: 23/12/2009.

Policies Applied:

CP2 – Protecting the Quality of the Rural and Built Environment

DBE9 – Loss of Amenity

DBE10 – Residential Extensions

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been adopted as national policy since March 2012. Paragraph 215 states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework. The above policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

Summary of Representations:

7 neighbours consulted – 7 replies received.

1 GREEN TREES: Objection. Concern that the dwelling is already on much higher ground and towers over houses in Green Trees. The house already occupies a disproportionate amount of our skyline.

2 GREEN TREES: Objection. The house has been the subject of past development and the existing window overlooks houses in Green Trees. This proposal will exacerbate this situation. This site is in danger of overdevelopment if this is not already the case.

3 GREEN TREES: Objection. Objection. Concern that the dwelling is already on much higher ground and towers over houses in Green Trees. The house already occupies a disproportionate amount of our skyline.

4 GREEN TREES: Objection. This dwelling looms over the entire Green Trees development, and any further additions would dwarf my house. The previous extension resulted in overlooking of No5 Green Trees. We have tried to mitigate the impact of previous development with screening but if further development is approved this will allow for a larger family to occupy the house.

5 GREEN TREES: Objection. Concern that this site is already overdeveloped. Previous development has resulted in a loss of amenity to us by allowing direct views into our property. The application property is built on much higher land and if it is enlarged any more it will be an even greater eyesore from our street and will result in a loss of amenity to our neighbour at No4. We also have concern about noise coming from the property and if further extensions are permitted this will exacerbate this issue.

6 GREEN TREES: Objection. Concern this is an overdevelopment and the proposed extensions would result in a large, ugly façade facing Green Trees. The property already dominates the skyline and any further additions would exacerbate this. Concern an increase in size could result in greater noise coming from this property.

7 GREEN TREES: Objection. Concern about overlooking and that the enlarged dwelling would be unduly dominant when viewed from Green Trees. Further additions would result in an overdevelopment of the site.

TOWN COUNCIL: Objection. Committee were concerned that the proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site and would not be in keeping with the streetscene. Members also drew attention to potential loss of amenity in relation to overlooking of properties in Green Trees.

Issues and Considerations:

The main issues to consider related to design, amenity and the comments of consultees.

The proposal has clearly been met with some concern by the occupants of the Green Trees development and the local Town Council. It is important therefore the issues raised are clearly addressed.

The first concern is that the proposed extensions would result in an overdevelopment of the site. The point is made that the original dwelling on the site was much smaller than that which currently exists. Officers are of the opinion that in order to be considered as an overdevelopment the house would have to appear crammed into the site. This would not be the case. The footprint of the building would not increase. The proposed extension would not increase the overall ridge height of the building. The house would not appear out of context or character with neighbouring houses on Hartland Road. The size of the original dwelling is of particular consequence on Green Belt dwellings but in urban areas this is not particularly relevant. Dwellings will alter and evolve in built up areas and the key concern for a Local Planning Authority is; does the resulting dwelling complement the existing house and remain in keeping with the streetscene? In this case the extensions are a logical way to extend the house in order to provide more living accommodation. The eastern side of Hartland Road contains a mix of dwelling styles; therefore the house would remain in character and would not appear excessively prominent or out of keeping. The dormer windows are similar in design to existing windows at first floor level. From a design perspective the

proposal raises no serious concerns and a condition agreeing matching materials would ensure a satisfactory appearance. This proposal would not result in an overdevelopment and in order to be considered such would involve a considerable increase in built form to what is proposed.

Concerns have been expressed by occupants of properties in Green Trees, behind the development site. It is clear that 34 Hartland Road sits on much higher ground than these dwellings. As such the dwelling is clearly visible from public vantage points in this development, such as the roadway serving the houses. Some neighbours have outlined how the existing dwelling "looms over" Green Trees and that further development would "dwarf" houses adjacent to the rear of the application site. In order to accept the case put forward by objectors to the scheme the Local Planning Authority would have to identify an "excessive loss of amenity" in line with Policy DBE9, or accept that the design is poor. Reference is made to previous development at the site and the visual harm this has caused. Although the rear of the house is visible from Green Trees it does not appear excessively dominant and the proposed additions would not significantly increase its presence. The building is well designed and it is difficult to accept that the increase in size of the building would harm residential amenity, particularly when it would only be viewed from public vantage points or front garden areas. There would be an increase in built form when viewed from Green Trees but this would not seriously impinge on amenity and the overall scale and massing of the building is reasonable. As stated previously the overall height of the building will not increase and the footprint will remain the same. The proposed loft addition would be set some 10.0m from the rear boundary and would not play a significant role in the streetscene of Green Trees.

Neighbour objections have also recorded concern about the impact on the skyline from Green Trees. This is effectively alluding to a loss of view which cannot be considered a material planning matter, and there would be no loss of outlook. It has also been stated that the development would result in overlooking. However the rear dormer window would look directly towards the flank wall of 4 Green Trees and views of No5 would be obscured by the existing rear wall of the house. There is therefore no case of overlooking with this proposal.

Therefore although the concerns of neighbours are noted, following a full assessment of this proposal against the relevant local policy it is considered that the design of the development is acceptable and there would be no serious loss of amenity to neighbouring residents. A condition agreeing a suitable finish is necessary to render the development acceptable in planning terms.

Other Issues

There are preserved trees on the site which will not be impacted by the development but it is considered necessary to add a condition regarding tree protection during construction to ensure that roots are not adversely affected by storage of materials etc.

Conclusion:

Notwithstanding the concerns of neighbours and the Town Council the proposal is deemed acceptable and recommended for approval with conditions.

Should you wish to discuss the contents of this report item please use the following contact details by 2pm on the day of the meeting at the latest:


***Planning Application Case Officer: Mr Dominic Duffin
Direct Line Telephone Number: (01992) 564336***

or if no direct contact can be made please email: contactplanning@eppingforestdc.gov.uk



Epping Forest District Council

Area Planning Sub-Committee East



The material contained in this plot has been reproduced from an Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery. (c) Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

EFDC licence No.100018534

Agenda Item Number:	8
Application Number:	EPF/0733/13
Site Name:	34 Hartland Road, Epping CM16 4PE
Scale of Plot:	1/1250