

# Committee Agenda



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

## **AREA PLANS SUBCOMMITTEE B Tuesday, 3rd May, 2005**

**Place:** Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Epping  
**Room:** Council Chamber  
**Time:** 7.30 pm  
**Democratic Services Officer** Gary Woodhall, Democratic Services Assistant  
tel: 01992 564470 email:gwoodhall@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Members:

Councillors M Colling (Chairman), A Green (Vice-Chairman), R Glozier, Mrs A Grigg, S Metcalfe, Mrs S Perry, Mrs P K Rush, D Stallan, C Whitbread, Mrs J H Whitehouse and J M Whitehouse

---

**A BRIEFING FOR THE CHAIRMAN, VICE-CHAIRMAN AND APPOINTED SPOKESPERSONS WILL BE HELD AT 6.30 P.M. IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1 ON THE DAY OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE.**

**1. ADVICE TO PUBLIC AND SPEAKERS AT COUNCIL PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEES (Pages 5 - 6)**

General advice to people attending the meeting is attached.

**2. MINUTES (Pages 7 - 12)**

To confirm the minutes of the last meeting of the Sub-Committee.

**3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

(Head of Research and Democratic Services) To declare interests in any item on this agenda.

**5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs 6 and 25 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.

**6. CONFIRMATION OF TPO/EPF/24/04 - 5 COOPERSALE COMMON, COOPERSALE, EPPING (Pages 13 - 14)**

(Head of Planning and Economic Development) To consider the attached report.

**7. CONFIRMATION OF TPO/EPF/32/04 - LAND BETWEEN 10 AMBLESIDE AND 7 GREENTREES, EPPING (Pages 15 - 16)**

(Head of Planning and Economic Development) To consider the attached report.

**8. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (Pages 17 - 70)**

(Head of Planning and Economic Development) To consider planning applications as set out in the attached schedule

**Background Papers:** (i) Applications for determination – applications listed on the schedule, letters of representation received regarding the applications which are summarised on the schedule. (ii) Enforcement of Planning Control – the reports of officers inspecting the properties listed on the schedule in respect of which consideration is to be given to the enforcement of planning control.

**9. DELEGATED DECISIONS**

(Head of Planning and Economic Development) Schedules of planning applications determined by the Head of Planning and Economic Development under delegated powers since the last meeting of a Plans Subcommittee may be inspected in the Members Room or at the Planning and Economic Development Information Desk at the Civic Offices, Epping.

**10. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

To consider whether, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on grounds that they will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act indicated:

<b>Agenda Item No</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Exempt Information Paragraph Number</b>
Nil	Nil	Nil

To resolve that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the following items which are confidential under Section 100(A)(2) of the Local Government Act 1972:

<b>Agenda Item No</b>	<b>Subject</b>
Nil	Nil

Paragraph 9 of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution require:

- (1) All business of the Council requiring to be transacted in the presence of the press and public to be completed by 10.00 p.m. at the latest.
- (2) At the time appointed under (1) above, the Chairman shall permit the completion of debate on any item still under consideration, and at his or her discretion, any other remaining business whereupon the Council shall proceed to exclude the public and press.
- (3) Any public business remaining to be dealt with shall be deferred until after the completion of the private part of the meeting, including items submitted for report rather than decision.

**Background Papers:** Paragraph 8 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution define background papers as being documents relating to the subject matter of the report which in the Proper Officer's opinion:

- (a) disclose any facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the report is based; and
- (b) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report does not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information (as defined in Rule 10) and in respect of executive reports, the advice of any political advisor.

Inspection of background papers may be arranged by contacting the officer responsible for the item.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Advice to Public and Speakers at Council Planning Subcommittees**

### **Are the meetings open to the public?**

Yes all our meetings are open for you to attend. Only in special circumstances are the public excluded.

### **When and where is the meeting?**

Details of the location, date and time of the meeting are shown at the top of the front page of the agenda along with the details of the contact officer and members of the Subcommittee. A map showing the venue will be attached to the agenda.

### **Can I speak?**

If you wish to speak **you must register with Democratic Services by 4.00 p.m. on the day before the meeting**. Ring the number shown on the top of the front page of the agenda. Speaking to a Planning Officer will not register you to speak, you must register with Democratic Service. Speakers are not permitted on Planning Enforcement or legal issues.

### **Who can speak?**

Three classes of speakers are allowed: One objector (maybe on behalf of a group), the local Parish or Town Council and the Applicant or his/her agent.

### **What can I say?**

You will be allowed to have your say about the application but you must bear in mind that you are limited to three minutes and if you are not present by the time your item is considered, the Subcommittee will determine the application in your absence.

### **Can I give the Councillors more information about my application or my objection?**

**Yes you can but it must not be presented at the meeting.** If you wish to send further information to Councillors, their contact details can be obtained through Democratic Services or our website [www.eppingforesdc.gov.uk](http://www.eppingforesdc.gov.uk). Any information sent to Councillors should be copied to the Planning Officer dealing with your application.

### **How are the applications considered?**

The Subcommittee will consider applications in the agenda order. On each case they will listen to an outline of the application by the Planning Officer. They will then hear any speakers presentations. The order of speaking will be (1) Objector, (2) Parish/Town Council, then (3) Applicant or his/her agent. The Subcommittee will then debate the application and vote on either the recommendations of officers in the agenda or a proposal made by the Subcommittee. Should the Subcommittee propose to follow a course of action different to officer recommendation, they are required to give their reasons for doing so.

The Subcommittee cannot grant any application, which is contrary to Local or Structure Plan Policy. In this case the application would stand referred to the next meeting of the District Development Control Committee.

### **Further Information?**

Can be obtained through Democratic Services or our leaflet 'Your Choice, Your Voice'

This page is intentionally left blank

## EPHING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Committee:** Area Plans Subcommittee B                      **Date:** 6 April 2005

**Place:** Civic Offices, High Street, Epping                      **Time:** 7.33 - 8.16 pm

**Members Present:** M Colling (Chairman), A Green (Vice-Chairman), R Glozier, Mrs A Grigg, Mrs S Perry, Mrs P K Rush, D Stallan and Mrs J H Whitehouse

**Other Councillors:** (none)

**Apologies:** S Metcalfe, C Whitbread and J M Whitehouse

**Officers Present:** B Land (Assistant Head of Planning and Economic Development) and G Woodhall (Democratic Services Assistant)

---

### 61. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Chairman welcomed members of the public to the meeting and outlined the procedures and arrangements agreed by the Council to enable persons to address the Sub-Committee in relation to the determination of applications for planning permission. The Sub-Committee noted the advice provided for the public and speakers in attendance at Council Planning Sub-Committee meetings.

### 62. MINUTES

#### RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2005 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### 63. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCIL MINUTE 39 - 23.7.02)

The Sub-Committee noted that this item had been withdrawn, as it was not applicable to this particular body.

### 64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor R Glozier declared a personal interest in the following items of the agenda for the meeting, by virtue of the Councillor also being a member of Theydon Bois Parish Council. The Councillor had determined that his interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the applications and voting thereon:

- (i) EPF/29/05 – 23 Morgan Crescent, Theydon Bois;
- (ii) EPF/97/05 – 25 Woodland Way, Theydon Bois;
- (iii) EPF/170/05 – 55 Woodland Way, Theydon Bois; and

- (iv) EPF/174/05 – 57 Morgan Crescent, Theydon Bois.
- (b) Pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct, Councillor Mrs S Perry declared a personal interest in the following items of the agenda for the meeting, by virtue of the Councillor also being a member of Epping Town Council. The Councillor had determined that her interest was not prejudicial and would remain in the meeting for the consideration of the applications and voting thereon:
  - (i) EPF/2071/04 – The Old Rectory, Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping; and
  - (ii) LB/EPF/2072/04 – The Old Rectory, Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping.

**65. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was reported that there was no urgent business for consideration at the meeting.

**66. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

The Sub-Committee considered a schedule of applications for planning permission.

**RESOLVED:**

That planning applications numbered 1-6 be determined as set out in the schedule attached to these minutes.

**67. DELEGATED DECISIONS**

The Sub-Committee noted that schedules of planning applications determined by the Head of Planning and Economic Development under delegated authority since the last meeting had been circulated and could be inspected at the Civic Offices.

**CHAIRMAN**



1. **APPLICATION NO:** EPF/2071/04 **PARISH:** Epping

**SITE ADDRESS:**

The Old Rectory, Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of detached garage.

**GRANTED SUBJECT TO:**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Materials of construction to be agreed.
3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995 (or of any equivalent provision in any Statutory Instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order), the garage(s) hereby approved shall be retained so that it is capable of allowing the parking of cars together with any ancillary storage in connection with the residential use of the site, and shall at no time be converted into a room or used for any other purpose.
4. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the amended plans received on 15 March 2005.

---

2. **APPLICATION NO:** LB/EPF/2072/04 **PARISH:** Epping

**SITE ADDRESS:**

The Old Rectory, Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Grade II Listed Building application for the demolition of existing outbuilding.

**GRANTED SUBJECT TO:**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.

---

3. **APPLICATION NO:** EPF/29/05 **PARISH:** Theydon Bois

**SITE ADDRESS:**

23 Morgan Crescent, Theydon Bois

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Single storey front, and two-storey side and rear extensions.

**GRANTED SUBJECT TO:**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved the proposed window openings in the north-west side elevation facing No. 25 Morgan Crescent shall be fitted with obscured glass and shall be permanently retained in that condition.
3. Materials shall match existing.
4. No further side windows without approval.

4. **APPLICATION NO:** EPF/97/05 **PARISH** Theydon Bois

**SITE ADDRESS:**

25 Woodland Way, Theydon Bois

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Two storey side and single storey rear extensions, and front porch.

**GRANTED SUBJECT TO:**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Materials shall match existing.
3. Prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved the proposed window openings in the flank wall shall be fitted with obscured glass and shall be permanently retained in that condition.
4. Balcony not to be formed.

5. **APPLICATION NO:** EPF/170/05 **PARISH** Theydon Bois

**SITE ADDRESS:**

55 Woodland Way, Theydon Bois

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Two storey side and part two storey, part single storey rear extensions.

**GRANTED SUBJECT TO:**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved the proposed window openings in the first floor flank elevation of the development hereby approved shall be fitted with obscured glass, and shall be permanently retained in that condition.

3. Materials shall match existing.
4. No further side windows without approval.

---

6. **APPLICATION NO:** EPF/174/05 **PARISH** Theydon Bois

**SITE ADDRESS:**

57 Morgan Crescent, Theydon Bois

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 1 No. detached house and 1 No. pair of semi-detached houses. (Revised application.)

**REFUSED:**

1. The proposals represent overdevelopment of the site resulting in a cramped appearance in the street scene detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of nearby properties contrary to policies DBE9 and 10 of the adopted Local Plan.
2. The design and appearance of the proposed dwellings does not sufficiently relate to the character of the surrounding properties, particularly in relation to the integral garages and the height of the dwellings relative to their width. As such the proposals are contrary to policies DBE1, DBE2 and DBE9 of the adopted Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Report to Area Plans Sub-Committee 'B'**

**Date of meeting: 3 May 2005.**

**Subject: Confirmation Of Tree Preservation Order EPF/24/04 at 5 Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping.**



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Officer contact for further information: Robin Hellier (01992 – 56 4546).**

**Democratic Service Officer: Gary Woodhall (01992 – 56 4470).**

---

### **Recommendations:**

**That Tree Preservation Order EPF/24/04 be confirmed.**

### **Background:**

1. Tree Preservation Order EPF/24/04 was made to protect 4 trees at 5 Coopersale Common, Coopersale, Epping. The trees protected are: T1 Blue Atlas cedar; T2 Cherry; T3 Birch; and T4 Plum.
2. The Tree Preservation Order was made as a result of a planning application to develop this plot that placed these trees under threat. They are considered important landscape features both as a group and as healthy individuals at a prominent corner within the village streetscene. They contribute greatly to greening the area and provide interesting seasonal colour.

### **Objection to the Tree Preservation Order:**

3. An objection to the Order has been made by the owners of the site. The grounds of the objection are as follows:
  - (a) T1 is not native to Britain and therefore should not be considered as a character element of an English country village;
  - (b) the trees T2, 3 & 4 are said to be sporadic and therefore do not create any continuous enclosure, which would generate character value;
  - (c) trees T2, 3 & 4 are said to be very young and immature and hence are not large enough to offer a framing effect to the street scene and therefore offer little visual interest in this way;
  - (d) it is asserted that the plum (T4) and cherry tree (T3) have been grown in the past for fruit and have not been sufficiently maintained. Thus, they have grown to considerable proportions to which they would not normally exist. These are simple fruit trees, of no importance, not inspiring and characterful oaks or horse chestnuts;
  - (e) T2,3 & 4 are garden trees, which do not create any character value to warrant a TPO;
  - (f) they have been grown for the amenity of 5 Coopersale Common and not for the benefit of the village; and
  - (g) their loss would have little impact on the local environment and the public amenity, due to their insignificance in character terms and the wooded character of the locality.

### **Response of the Head of Planning and Economic Development:**

4. Cedars have become established and widely enjoyed as outstanding landmark trees in prominent positions within British country villages for many centuries. This specimen is of good form, interesting colour and has the potential to develop into a significant landscape feature. Being non-native in no way detracts from the amenity value of this tree.
5. The growing habits of T2, cherry and T4, plum are spreading in nature. They are both important screening trees, which significantly enclose the site. Moreover, the mixed planting produces interest and character directly contrary to the assertion raised in the objection.
6. T2,3 and 4 are not immature and are of a reasonable mature size offering both framing and visual amenity to the street scene at this prominent corner plot.
7. Whether or not these trees have been grown and managed for fruit is secondary to their current amenity value. Having asserted previously that these trees are immature and of little visual significance it appears contradictory to claim that they have grown to 'considerable proportions'. Simple fruit trees can display considerable character and can often be inspiring. Both trees are typical of such a village setting and are therefore of high amenity value and important in this context.
8. In the case of the birch, in particular, such a garden tree has ample character to warrant protection.
9. The fact that T2,3 and 4 are clearly visible from the main thoroughfare makes them an important village landscape feature, irrespective of whether or not they were planted with this intention. Such thoughtful and attractive garden planting benefits the local environment and public.
10. The loss of these trees would have a significant impact on this area because the woodland referred to is separated from this plot by some distance and is of a different forest character.

### **Conclusions:**

11. All points made in the objection have been addressed. The trees protected by this order are healthy and attractive specimens, forming a highly visible established public amenity. Landscaping policy requires that adequate provision be made for the retention of trees in these situations. These trees are under threat from the planning proposal and therefore deserve protection. Confirmation of the order is recommended.

## **Report to Area Plans Sub-Committee 'B'**

**Date of meeting: 3 May 2005.**

**Subject: Confirmation Of Tree Preservation Order EPF/32/04  
Land between 10 Ambleside & 7 Green Trees, Epping.**



**Officer contact for further information: Robin Hellier (01992 – 56 4546).**

**Democratic Services Officer: Gary Woodhall (01992 – 56 4470).**

---

### **Recommendation:**

**That, subject to the amendment of the location plan, Tree Preservation Order EPF/32/04 is confirmed.**

### **Background:**

1. Tree Preservation Order EPF/32/04 was made to protect a number of trees on land between 7 Green Trees and 10 Ambleside, Epping. The trees protected are:
  - (a) sycamore x 2;
  - (b) ash x 9;
  - (c) cherry x 1; and
  - (d) whitebeam x 1.
2. The Tree Preservation Order was made as a result of errors made in the making of a previous order, which rendered the trees vulnerable to pruning. As a planted landscape group these trees were considered important in softening and screening the boundary between properties and aiding the reduction in water run off and although not an outstanding specimens G1 contributed to greening of the area.

### **Objection to the Tree Preservation Order:**

3. A written representation from the owner of 10 Ambleside has highlighted an inaccuracy in the plan of the Order, which shows G1 extending further along the rear boundary fence than it does in reality.

### **Response from Head of Planning and Economic Development:**

4. When the TPO was made, an inaccuracy occurred in the drawing of the group of trees marked on the plan as G1. This was brought to the council's attention in the form of a letter from a notified resident and has been treated as an objection. This has been rectified on a revised plan, where the stems of all protected trees have been more precisely shown within the dashed line. This revised plan will be put before the committee for confirmation as the true representation of the trees to be protected.

### **Conclusions:**

5. The objection highlighted the need for the Order to be corrected. This has been done and therefore, in the absence of any other objections, and with the inclusion of the revised plan, the order can be confirmed.

This page is intentionally left blank



## AREA PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE 'B'

### INDEX OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS/ENFORCEMENT

#### CASES

ITEM	REFERENCE	SITE LOCATION	PAGE
1.	EPF/1943/04	Thatched House Hotel, 236 High Street, Epping	19
2.	LB/EPF/1944/04	Thatched House Hotel, 236 High Street, Epping	23
3.	EPF/2251/04	Thatched House Hotel, 236 High Street, Epping	25
4.	LB/EPF/2252/04	Thatched House Hotel, 236 High Street, Epping	28
5.	EPF/2383/04	London Underground Sub Station Site, Crossing Road, Epping	29
6.	EPF/113/05	44 Tower Road, Epping	39
7.	EPF/124/05	Abridge Village Hall, Ongar Road, Abridge Lambourne	43
8.	EPF/2195/04	Weald Hall Nursing Home, Weald Hall Lane, Thornwood, North Weald	49
9	EPF/93/05	224 High Road, North Weald	57
10	EPF/2293/04	17 The Weind, Theydon Bois	66

This page is intentionally left blank

---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/1943/04

Report Item No: 1

**SITE ADDRESS:**

THATCHED HOUSE HOTEL, 236 HIGH STREET, EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** Mr D Demetriou

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Creation of loft bedrooms within existing and approved (LB/EPF/1019/04) roof space including new dormer windows.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Details of the types and colours of the external finishes shall be submitted for approval by the Local Planning Authority in writing prior to the commencement of the development, and the development shall be implemented in accordance with such approved details including the rooflights hereby permitted.

**Description of Proposal:**

Creation of loft bedrooms within existing and approved (EPF/1019/04) roof space including new roof lights (revised application).

**Description of Site:**

A grade II listed hotel and public house dating from the 18th century, within the Epping Town centre conservation area.

**Relevant History:**

Various including

LB/EPF/1036/02 - Listed building consent for partial demolition of hotel and erection of 14 dwelling units - Approved

EPF/1035/02 - Planning application as above - Approved

LB/EPF/1019/04 - Amended listed building consent application re above - Approved

EPF/1018/04 - Alterations as above - Approved

## Policies Applied:

Local Plan  
HC6 Development in a Conservation Area  
DBE9 and 10 Amenity  
T14 Parking

## Issues and Considerations:

The main issues are the impact of this proposal on amenity, conservation area and effects on parking.

### Amenity

The plans have been revised since the application was first made with various internal revisions and the deletion of the dormers from the scheme. The listed building aspects are the subject of a separate application.

This site is currently being redeveloped with the modern rear part of the hotel being demolished. It is proposed to install two new bedrooms with attached en-suite bathrooms in the second floor roof space. These would have six roof lights installed, two on the southern roof slope, and four on the northern roof slope. The two on the southern slope would be used for egress from the building in the event of fire etc. Some internal works would be carried out to the roof area and the first floor areas involving the provision of staircases.

There will be no overlooking of the new dwellings to the rear of the site and it is considered that there will be no further adverse effects as a result of this proposal.

### Conservation Area

The site is situated within the Epping Town Conservation Area. Whilst it is the case that these are new openings within the roof of the building, only part of one of the roof lights will be visible from the rear of the site, the others all being hidden from view due to their location. Therefore it is considered that there is no harm to the character or appearance of the conservation area.

### Parking

The current hotel has 10 bedrooms, and this proposal would provide another two. The applicant has stated that there will be 10 car parking spaces allocated to the hotel as part of the previously granted permission. It should be noted that this is a town centre location with good public transport links and therefore the proposed parking provision is adequate.

## Other Issues


The Town Council has raised the issue of the need for further bedrooms at the site. However this is not an issue that can be considered in this context.

## Conclusion

The recommendation is therefore for approval.

## **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

TOWN COUNCIL - Object to this application on the basis that the proposed development will have insufficient parking and will overlook adjacent flats and represents overdevelopment of this site. Committee also commented that the recent removal of bedrooms from this hotel and the development of flats in their place was the result of poor demand and in view of this there would seem to be little demand for further bedrooms for this hotel.



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

Item Nos 1 to 4  
Scale: 1:1250



---

**APPLICATION No:** LB/EPF/1944/04

Report Item No: 2

**SITE ADDRESS:**

THATCHED HOUSE HOTEL, 236 HIGH STREET, EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** Mr D Demetriou

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Grade II Listed Building application for creation of loft bedroom within existing and approved (LB/EPF/1019/04) roof space including new dormer windows.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse**

1. The proposed works would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of this Grade II listed building due to the size, number and siting of the roof lights and the effects of the internal works on the historic fabric of the building and are contrary to Policy HC10 of the adopted Local Plan and HC3 of the Replacement Structure Plan for Essex and Southend on Sea.

Description of Proposal:

This is the listed building application for creation of loft bedrooms within existing and approved (EPF/1019/04) roof space including new roof lights (revised application).

Policies Applied:

Structure Plan  
HC3 Protection of listed buildings

Local Plan  
HC10 Listed Buildings

Issues and Considerations:

The only issue is the impact of this proposal on the Listed Building.

The plans have been revised since the application was first made with various internal revisions and the deletion of the dormers from the scheme.

This site is currently being redeveloped with the modern rear part of the hotel being demolished. It is proposed to install

two new bedrooms with attached en-suite bathrooms in the second floor roof space. These would have six roof lights installed, two on the southern roof slope, and four on the northern roof slope. The two on the southern slope would be used for egress from the building in the event of fire etc. Some internal works would be carried out to the roof area and the first floor areas involving the provision of staircases.

The County Listed Building Adviser has commented:

"The extent of alteration and practicality of the second floor is of concern, and the number and size of roof lights is of concern....

"I recommend refusal of the applications.....In its current state the scheme is unlikely to be practical and has insufficient clarity. Furthermore the elements that are clear such as the proliferation of too-large and too-numerous roof lights would be detrimental to the character and interest of the listed building."

Therefore it is considered that this proposal causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the listed building and is therefore recommended for refusal.

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

TOWN COUNCIL - Objected to this application expressing concern that the additional bedrooms proposed would require further parking, but that the owner of this hotel had recently sold off a large number of bedrooms for residential development and had also at that time reduced the availability of parking for the hotel. Given the problems relating to parking in the town, Committee felt that it would not be sensible to approve the hotel extension without ensuring adequate parking was available for this business use.



---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/2251/04

Report Item No: 3

**SITE ADDRESS:**

THATCHED HOUSE HOTEL, 236 HIGH STREET, EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** Mr D Demitriou

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Proposed tourist information centre.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse**

1. The proposed side extension, because of its materials and design detracts from the appearance and character of the Epping Town Conservation Area, contrary to policy HC6 of the Councils Adopted Local Plan and HC2 of the adopted Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan.

Description of Proposal:

It is proposed to create a Tourist Information Centre on the southern flank of the existing building.

Description of Site:

A grade II listed hotel and public house dating from the 18th century, within the Epping Town centre conservation area.

Relevant History:

Various including

LB/EPF/1036/02 - Partial demolition of hotel and erection of 14 dwelling units - Approved

EPF/1035/02 - As above - Approved

LB/EPF/1019/04 - Amended application re above - Approved

EPF/1018/04 - Alterations as above - Approved

Policies Applied:

Structure Plan

HC2 Conservation Areas

HC3 Protection of listed buildings

Local Plan

HC6 Development in a conservation area

HC10 Listed Buildings

## DBE9 Amenity

### Issues and Considerations:

The main issues are the impact of this proposal on the Listed Building and the conservation area.

### Listed Building

This site is currently being redeveloped with the modern rear part of the hotel being demolished. It is proposed to erect a single storey tourist information centre building on the southern flank of the existing building, on the side of the Coach entrance arch. It measures 2.9m x 5.6m by 3.9m high. The building is designed to appear as a lean-to but in fact there would be a small gap of 15cm between the wall of the hotel and the rear wall of the centre.

The County Listed Building Adviser has commented that: "I am concerned about the token shifting of the proposed building away from the listed building which, as it is filled with metal mesh and is likely to require some connection for weathering would not overcome any of the previous problems and would leave the listed building and new building both vulnerable to damp.

"I am also concerned about the mounting detail and size of the proposed roof-mounted sign and the size and position of the sign on the bay of the listed building.

"There is still discrepancy about doors and the disabled access is impractical as it is shown with steps, and with a ramp likely to obstruct the pavement.

"The extension as submitted lacks clarity and is likely to cause damage to the listed building, and the proposed signage by means of size, framework and position will dominate significant features of interest of the listed building. I therefore recommend refusal of the applications".

Refusal is therefore recommended due to the harm caused to the character and appearance of the listed building.

### Design & Conservation Area

The structure would be a timber building with a monopitch roof, adjacent to the hotel. It is the case that whilst part of the hotel on its southern flank has some weatherboarding at the first floor, the majority of the building visible from the High Street, and the buildings to the south are all of white painted brick or render. Whilst the lean-to design is not inappropriate in this area, it is in a prominent position and the weatherboarding does not integrate well with the street scene and has a temporary and inappropriate appearance in this

part of the Conservation Area. It is also the case that this would be an extension on the side of an existing extension which is visually awkward.

Since harm is caused to the character of the listed building, this too results in harm to the Conservation Area.

#### Amenity

This proposal would introduce a small modest building into an existing visual gap between the Thatched House and Campion Court when viewed from the High Street. This gap is not unattractive with trees being seen to the rear of the site, but it is considered that this building will not cause such harm to the street scene as to justify a refusal. There would be no harm caused to the amenities of the adjacent commercial businesses from this proposal.

#### Parking

There are no highways objections to this scheme.

#### Conclusion

In view of the impact upon the character of the listed building and the conservation area generally, the recommendation is for refusal.

#### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

##### Original Plan

TOWN COUNCIL - Object on the basis that the proposed location and style of the facility will be detrimental to this listed building and proposals represent overdevelopment of this important site.

EPPING SOCIETY - Object, out of keeping with Epping High Street conservation area, looks like a garden shed, inappropriate materials.

##### Revised Plans

TOWN COUNCIL - Object unanimously to this application on the basis of the proposed location and style of the facility will be detrimental to this listed building and proposals represent overdevelopment of this important site.`

---

**APPLICATION No:** LB/EPF/2252/04

Report Item No: 4

**SITE ADDRESS:**

THATCHED HOUSE HOTEL, 236 HIGH STREET, EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** Mr D Demetriou

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Grade II Listed Building application for a proposed tourist information centre.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse**

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of its design, siting, and materials detracts from the visual quality and character of this Grade II building of special architectural or historic interest. The proposal is at odds with policy HC10 of the adopted Local Plan, and policy HC3 of the Essex and Southend on Sea Replacement Structure Plan.

Description of Proposal:

This is the listed building application that goes with the previous item.

All issues related to the listed building interests are fully reported in the previous item and it is concluded that this application should be recommended for refusal as well.

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

Original Plan

TOWN COUNCIL - Object on the basis that the proposed location and style of the facility will be detrimental to this listed building and proposals represent overdevelopment of this important site

EPPING SOCIETY - Object, out of keeping with Epping High Street conservation area, looks like a garden shed, inappropriate materials.

Revised Plans

TOWN COUNCIL - Object unanimously to this application on the basis of the proposed location and style of the facility will be detrimental to this listed building and proposals represent overdevelopment of this important site.

---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/2383/04

Report Item No: 5

**SITE ADDRESS:**

LONDON UNDERGROUND SUB STATION SITE, CROSSING ROAD,  
EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** L.W.(Developments) Ltd

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Partial demolition and conversion of former sub-station to form 13 flats, erection of 4 new dwellings and new basement car park and associated landscaping. (Revised application)

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Contaminated land study and remediation.
3. Materials of construction to be agreed.
4. Prior to commencement of the development, a full noise survey should be carried out to establish which noise category the proposed plots fall into with regard to PPG24. Following the survey a scheme for protecting the proposed new dwellings from noise, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority for any dwellings, gardens and recreation areas that fall into NECB and C or above, as detailed in PPG24. All works, which form part of the scheme, shall be completed before any of the proposed residential development is occupied.
5. The method of construction of the basement car park shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. No work shall commence on the basement car park until such written approval is obtained. Only construction methods in accordance with the written approval shall be undertaken.
6. No bonfires shall be permitted on site throughout the construction phase of the development.
7. Prior to any demolition, a scheme for dealing with dust suppression shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed scheme should be implemented and maintained during the construction of the development.

8. Notwithstanding the details submitted further details of refuse storage and collection facilities, including the design details of any structures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby approved is commenced, and such details as approved shall be implemented before the building, or any part of thereof is used and must be retained permanently for the storage and collection of refuse.
  
9. All construction/demolition works and ancillary operations (which includes deliveries and other commercial vehicles to and from the site) which are audible at the boundary of noise sensitive premises, shall only take place on site between the hours of 07.30 to 18.30 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturday, and at no time during Sundays and Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  
10. Erection of screen walls/fences.
  
11. Wheel washing equipment to be installed.
  
12. Replacement tree or trees.
  
13. Submission of Landscape Proposals
  
14. Submission of Landscape Method Statement
  
15. Submission of Landscape Management Plan
  
16. A flood risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The assessment shall include calculations of increased run-off and associated volume of storm detention using Windes or other similar programme. The approved measures shall be undertaken prior to the first occupation of the building hereby approved and shall be adequately maintained.
  
17. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the proposed surface materials for the access road, footpath, parking bays and turning

head shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed surface treatment shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development. This shall include details of any preventative measures, such as railings to keep the footpath (leading to the bridge over the railway line) free from obstruction. The details as agreed shall be retained thereafter.

Subject also to the applicant entering into a LEGAL AGREEMENT under SECTION 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act to carry out the surfacing of the adjacent public footpath at the applicants expense and to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, prior to the first occupation of any of the residential units on the site.

#### Description of Proposal:

Revised application for alterations and conversion of existing sub-station to form 13 flats with basement parking and erection of four, two bedroomed dwelling houses.

#### Description of Site:

The application site comprises an elongated piece of land of approximately 0.2 ha. at the northern end of Crossing Road, a small residential cul-de-sac off Allnutts Road and to the rear of Charles Street.

The site adjoins London Underground's Central Line and currently houses a large brick built flat roofed sub-station building originally associated with the rail line.

A footpath runs along the western edge of the site leading to a pedestrian bridge over the rail line accessing into Sunnyside road on the western side of the rail line.

The site currently contains the sub-station and is heavily treed. Several of the mature trees are covered by a preservation order.

There are residential dwellings and their gardens to the rear of the site (Charles Street) and dwellings on both sides of Crossing Road leading up to the site.

#### Relevant History:

EPF/460/03 - Conversion and alterations to existing sub-station to form 18 flats and erection of 4 dwellings with parking - Refused - Appeal dismissed.

EPF/2014/01 - Demolition of sub-station buildings and erection of eight, two storey residential dwellings - Approved.

Policies Applied:

Structure Plan:

Policy CS1 (Achieving sustainable urban regeneration)  
Policy CS4 (Sustainable new development)  
Policy BE1 (Urban intensification)  
Policy BE5 (Planning obligations)  
Policy H3 (Location of residential development)  
Policy H4 (Development form of new residential developments)

Local Plan:

Policy H3 (Criteria for assessing development sites)  
Policy H1 (Adequacy of infrastructure)  
Policy DBE1 (Design of new buildings)  
Policy DBE2 (Detrimental effect on existing surrounding properties)  
Policy DBE3 (Development in urban areas)  
Policy DBE5 (Design and layout)  
Policy DBE6 (Car parking)  
Policy DBE8 (Private amenity space)  
Policy DBE9 (Excessive loss of amenity for neighbouring properties)  
Policy RP4 (Development of contaminated land)  
Policy LL6 (Urban landscape)  
Policy LL7 & LL8 (Planting and protection of preserved trees)  
Policy LL10 & LL11 (Landscaping)  
Policy T3 (Footways and crossing facilities)  
Policy T5 (Criteria for accessing proposals)  
Policy T14 (Car parking)  
Policy T17 (Assessing new proposals)

Issues and Considerations:

The key issues for consideration with this revised proposal are whether the revised details overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the appeal inspector's concerns in dismissing the appeal.

General Context & Background

The site lies within a mainly residential area the main character of which is of small tight knit, two storey dwelling houses with small narrow rear gardens. The majority of dwellings date from early to mid-1900s although there are some properties specifically adjacent the site's southern boundary which were constructed in the 1960s.

Crossing Road although short contains a mixture of house styles and sizes with differing garden sizes. The application site lies at the head of the cul-de-sac from which a public footpath



only continues to the northern end separated from the site by a two metre high open wire fence. At the northern end of the site is a group of mature oak trees which are prominent features of the street scene particularly when viewed from the south.

The footpath continues over the rail line embankment on a pedestrian bridge. To the north of the site is a triangular piece of land comprising a detached bungalow, its privacy and setting needs to be considered.

To the rear of the site (east) are the rear gardens of properties fronting Charles Street and are partially screened from the site by a variety of mature trees some of which are preserved. The main feature of the site is a large flat roofed structure (sub-station) some 11 metres high and sited fairly central within the width of the site towards the northern end.

The building due to its scale and bulk has a strong visual presence and impact on the overall appearance of the area as does the site as a whole which has a rundown and derelict appearance.

Planning consent was originally granted for demolition of the sub-station building and redevelopment of the site for eight 2 storey dwellings and therefore, the principle of residential use of the site was established. However, a subsequent application to retain the sub-station building and convert it to provide 18 flat units was refused contrary to officers recommendation mainly because of overdevelopment, development being out of character and detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring dwellings due loss of privacy and overlooking.

In the event the Inspector did dismiss an appeal against that decision but only on the grounds of its effect upon the amenities of adjacent housing and to some extent the future occupants of some of the proposed flats. He did not agree that the proposal was out of character and accepted that the proposal was a sustainable form of development.

## Design

The current scheme differs from the previous application in that it proposes a reduction in flats reducing the number from 18 to 13 and provides the flats on the eastern side at 1st and 2nd floor with indented screened terraces which allow natural light to the flats whilst ensuring no overlooking occurs from windows on this side.

This alteration results in a remodelling of the rear elevation of the building, partially reducing its current unrelieved block appearance and ensuring that occupants of the new flats gain external amenity space without impinging on the privacy of neighbouring dwellings.

The plans continue to provide basement parking, the latest amended plans indicating the provision of 15 car parking spaces, 2 motorcycle and 12 bicycle spaces. The ground floor now comprises two, 2 bed and one, 1-bed flats, first and second floor plans indicate the provision of four, 2 bedroom flats each.

The building's front and side exterior is little changed save for the removal of some flat roofed projections on the front (western elevation) and the insertion of small, simple square windows to each floor in keeping with the industrial character of the building.

A slight reduction in the building's height of approximately 1 metre is proposed with the top storey covered in grey cladding above a blue brick string course.

Vehicle entrance to the building is gained from the southern end elevation (fronting Crossing Road) whilst pedestrian access is via the western elevation (facing the footpath) with a pedestrian link to the public footpath.

Currently the building has some window apertures on each elevation at differing heights, particularly at second floor height on the north, south and east elevations. These are removed at 1st and 2nd floor on the south and eastern elevation and changed to high level windows on the northern end elevation fronting the bungalow (43b Charles Street). Windows previously serving lounges and bedrooms on this elevation have now been removed.

The proposal also continues to include the construction of a terrace of four, two storey dwelling houses on the southern part of the site. Designed to continue the street elevation of Crossing Road the houses are of traditional appearance with generous pitched roofs and projecting gables. The rear elevations are of a one and a half storey appearance with first floor windows breaking the eaves as flat roofed dormers. The dwellings have individual rear gardens and are intended to introduce a historic character back into the area.

## Highways

The revised development still comprises the retention of the public footpath and continued extension of Crossing Road to access the existing building and the four new dwellings. A turning head between the housing terrace and the sub-station, in accordance with the design guide parameters, has been provided.

The current public footpath is retained and the applicants have indicated their willingness to resurface the path up to the pedestrian bridge. Subject to conditions no objections to this arrangement have been raised by the Council's Highway Services.

Car parking as well as motorcycle and bicycle provision and its layout meets the current adopted standards and the development, therefore, accords with the Local Plan transport policies.

#### Landscaping and Trees

Previously there was concern regarding the safeguarding of trees adjacent the eastern side of the site, many of these are shown retained on the current scheme. There are however, some trees shown to be removed and in particular a large birch tree which overhangs the building. It would not be practical to retain this tree in its present form with residential use of the building. On balance however, the Council's landscape officer is concerned that a refusal on this ground alone could not be substantiated. He feels that the replacement by other, perhaps more appropriate specimens, is an acceptable compromise in this case. Conditions requiring this can be imposed.

Generally because of the proposal to retain the sub-station building disturbance to the tree environment will be minimized, and the scheme does show most of the other important trees on the site have been retained.

#### Other Issues

A number of issues relating to development of this site were raised during the processing of the previous application and appeal and have been considered again:

#### Drainage

No objections have been raised to the proposal by the Council's land drainage division provided an acceptable urban drainage system (SUDS) is devised and installed on site and this can be achieved by way of condition.

#### Car Parking and Traffic Generation

The position of this site within a cul-de-sac will inevitably create some disturbance and possible traffic congestion during construction. This is a difficult situation to control through planning legislation since congestion is likely to be off-site and therefore outside the scope of planning conditions.

A variety of conditions have, however been recommended which will go a considerable way towards restricting possible disturbance to neighbours during construction works.

The current scheme provides for parking under the building as before with additional parking for the dwellings and visitor parking provided on site. Subject to conditions and construction details the transport and highways division is satisfied that current parking standards have been met and raise no objection to the proposal. On this aspect it should be noted that the Inspector in the last appeal was satisfied

regarding the parking provision.

#### Overlooking, Loss of Privacy

Concern remains with some neighbours in Charles Street about overlooking and possible loss of privacy. Whilst this concern is understandable it is important that members look at the specifics in this case.

The scheme has been revised particularly with this factor in mind. There are now only small windows on the rear elevation at ground floor level. In view of the foliage that will remain on this boundary overlooking will severely be minimised and will be no greater than that which occurs in any urban area. Upper floor windows are now screened from any direct vision line and will not overlook.

A concern remains that this building is large and obtrusive within the area however it is there and the inspector was quite clear in his view regarding this fact. Reuse of an existing building is a good sustainable practise and was not faulted in principle in the previous appeal.

#### Conclusions

Given the location of this site within a residential area and the previous planning consent, development is acceptable in principle.

In the last appeal no objection was raised to the principle of conversion of this building but dismissed because of the effect of overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

The current scheme has been redesigned to overcome these latter concerns and it is considered that these alterations will be effective in so doing.

As such it is considered that the revisions do overcome the previous reasons for refusal and the reasons for the dismissal on appeal.

The application is therefore, recommended for approval subject to the schedule of conditions and the requirements of a legal agreement.

#### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

TOWN COUNCIL - Object, the site would clearly benefit from development but the current proposals are unsatisfactory and would be intrusive to neighbouring properties and cause congestion to the local highway system.

67 CHARLES STREET - Concern about loss of preserved silver birch tree.

71 CHARLES STREET - Object would reduce light reaching my

property, overlooking increased by addition of balconies, loss of light and security, increase traffic movement and levels of noise and pollution and concerns about landscaping.

69 CHARLES STREET - Loss of birch tree.

9 CROSSING ROAD - Oppose, on grounds of safety and overdevelopment from disturbance from development.

17 CROSSING ROAD - Concerned about drainage and levels.


63 CHARLES STREET - Structure is out of keeping in area and its conversion would result in loss of light, overlooking, fumes from car park and loss of trees.

43b CHARLES STREET - I live adjacent to site and have no objection in principle to scheme. Would prefer to see site developed as it has become a dumping ground.

10 CROSSING ROAD - Generally in favour of development of site, I believe proposals will enhance area and be of benefit to neighbours.

Second letter from 67 CHARLES STREET - Proposal will make building appear more bulky and overbearing, loss of privacy, do not like idea of basement parking because of pollution.

Second letter from 69 CHARLES STREET - Concerned that the only thing that makes building bearable is current tree screen which would not be compatible with proposed use. Steps taken to overcome overlooking have resulted in building having more invasive impact. Building inappropriate to area. Loss of trees. Terraces could lead to noise increase.



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

Item No: 5  
Scale: 1:1250



---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/113/05

Report Item No: 6

**SITE ADDRESS:**  
44 TOWER ROAD, EPPING

**PARISH:** Epping

**APPLICANT:** K Greene & R King

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**  
Two storey side and rear extension.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Prior to first occupation of the building hereby approved the proposed window openings in the northwest elevation of the side extension and the southeast facing light of the first floor bay shall be fitted with obscured glass and have fixed frames, and shall be permanently retained in that condition.
3. Materials shall match existing.
4. No further side windows without approval

**Description of Proposal:**

It is proposed to erect a two storey side and rear extension.

The side extension would be set back 2.6m from the front wall of the house at ground floor and 3.7m at first floor. It would be set 800mm from the boundary of the property with No. 46 Tower Road and have a hipped roof matching the pitch of the existing roof with a lower ridge height reflecting its much shorter depth. Obscure glazed windows to bathrooms and a utility room would be contained in the side elevation.

At ground floor the rear addition would project 3.15m across the entire rear elevation. At first floor it would be staggered with that part on the boundary with No. 42 Tower Road projecting 1.2m and, beyond 450mm from the boundary, projecting 1.5m. The remainder of the rear addition at first floor would project 2.1m.

#### Description of Site:

The application property is a semi-detached house located on the northeast side of Tower Road. It is not within a conservation area. No. 46 Tower Road is on the same alignment as No. 44, has a single storey rear projection projecting approximately 2.5m and a detached garage in the rear garden 3m beyond the rear elevation on the boundary with No. 44. The flank walls of both Nos. 44 and 46 Tower Road are set 2.1m from the boundary and No. 46 is on land that is approximately 500mm lower than that at the application site.

#### Relevant History:

EPF/37/75 - Erection of single storey rear addition and detached garage - Approved 04.02.75. This consent does not appear to have been taken up.

#### Policies Applied:

DBE9 - Impact on amenity  
DBE10 - Extensions to dwellings

#### Issues and Considerations:

The main issues to be considered in this case are the acceptability of its design and its impact on amenity.

The first floor part of the rear addition is only 1.2m in depth on the boundary and this is within a 45 degree line taken from the nearest edge of the first floor window of No. 42 Tower Road and would be set well away from No. 46 Tower Road. Due to this relationship, together with the modest depth of the ground floor part of the rear extension and since the rear elevation of the house faces northeast, the proposed rear extension would not cause any loss of light or appear overbearing. As there would be no windows in the flank elevations of the rear addition it would also not lead to any overlooking of neighbouring properties.

Given the alignment of the houses at Nos. 44 and 46 Tower Road and that the windows in the flank elevation of the proposed side addition would be obscure glazed the addition would have an adverse impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of No. 46 Tower Road.

Overall, the proposal would have no adverse impact on residential amenity although it would be appropriate to impose conditions relating to obscure glazing and the formation of additional windows in the flank elevations on any consent granted.



With regard to design, the appearance of the extensions would complement that of the existing house whilst clearly appearing subordinate to it. The side addition would, however, only be set 800mm from the boundary with no. 46 Tower Road rather than the 1m suggested in the supporting text of policy DBE10. The aim of the policy is to ensure extensions have a satisfactory appearance and, in particular, do not harm the street scene by causing a terracing effect. In this case it is considered that because of its considerable set back from the front main wall of the house, much lower roof height and the difference in levels between Nos. 44 and 46 Tower Road, the 800mm set in from the boundary is more than sufficient to ensure a strong visual separation of the houses is maintained and to prevent any terracing effect from occurring. Consequently the proposal meets the aims of policy DBE10.

#### Conclusion

The proposed extension is acceptable development that accords with the aims, if not the letter, of adopted planning policy. It is therefore recommended that conditional planning permission be granted.

#### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

TOWN COUNCIL - Committee had no objection to this application provided that the distance between the building and the boundary should in no place be less than one metre.



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

Item No: 6  
Scale: 1:1250



---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/124/05

Report Item No: 7

**SITE ADDRESS:**

ABRIDGE VILLAGE HALL, ONGAR ROAD, ABRIDGE  
LAMBOURNE

**PARISH:** Lambourne

**APPLICANT:** Lambourne Parish Council

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Erection of multi-use games area adjacent to doctor's surgery and village hall.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Refuse**

1. The proposed development would detract from the open character of the site and from the Metropolitan Green Belt, it would therefore be contrary to policies GB2, GB7, LL1 and LL3 of the adopted Local Plan.
2. The development of a multi use games area in the position proposed is likely to give rise to undue noise and disturbance to residents of neighbouring properties and would be contrary to policies RST1 and RTS22 of the adopted Local Plan.

**Description of Proposal:**

Proposal involves the creation of a multi-use games area (20.0m wide x 25.0m deep) surrounded by 3.0m high mesh fencing. The pitch will be marked out for football, netball and basketball.

**Description of Site:**

Area of open land laid to grass which is positioned between the car park serving the doctors surgery and village hall and the cottages in Ongar Road. The site is opposite the junction with New Farm Drive as it is currently an open field it affords views out across the Roding Valley towards Epping Lane.

**Relevant History:**

Outline planning permission for village hall and playing fields granted October 1986. Details approved June 1971. Doctors surgery approved August 1992. Machinery barn approved in May 1992.

Policies Applied:

Metropolitan Green Belt policies GB2, GB7  
Recreation/Sport - RST1, RST22  
Criteria for accepting potentially intrusive activities  
LL1 to LL3 - Rural landscape

Issues and Considerations:

The main issues in relation to this proposal concern the appropriateness of the development in the Green Belt; its impact in both physical and visual terms and potential impact on the neighbours and area as a whole.

The proposal amounts to the provision of an outdoor recreational facility on a Green Belt site. The use is therefore in accordance with Local Authority, as well as government policy which identifies outdoor participatory sport and recreation as appropriate development in the Green Belt.

Lambourne Parish Council has provided a statement in support of their proposals and this states in part:-

"The Village Hall has provided a football pitch for the last ten years, which is used by Abridge FC, complete with changing rooms. Training on a grassed area is allowed during the week and Chigwell Boys FC also use the facility. Members of the Youth Partnership and their friends are also allowed to play informal football on the practice area, which they do most evenings of the year.

"This September NACRO offered to start up a club for young people if they could be provided with free accommodation. The club meets once a week with about 30 young people attending between the ages of 8-16. The Trustees have provided the hall and the field and the Parish Council have agreed to fund the rent for a trial period. One of the leading members of the young people is now training to be a leader with NACRO.

"The Abridge Youth Partnership have seen the recently constructed all-weather pitch at Chigwell Row and feel that something similar would be ideal for Abridge. The Trustees have agreed in principle to provide an area 20m x 25m for the facility and have agreed to contribute œ10,000 towards the anticipated cost of œ40,000. Lambourne Parish Council has allocated œ10,000, and Grange Farm Trust has made a grant of œ10,000. The young people have raised œ2,000. Officers of Epping Forest District Council are supportive of the scheme, as are the Police. Councillor J Knapman, Leader of Epping Forest District Council, recently attended our Parish Council meeting and gave his support to the scheme including offering financial support. Indeed he is on record as having encouraged every parish to construct such a facility.

"Initially the pitch will be marked out for football, netball and basketball. These activities are felt to be the most appropriate but other markings may be considered in the future."

Amended plans have also been submitted in respect of the proposed development whereby the games area has been moved away from the boundary where it would have adjoined Marsh Cottages; and located parallel to the car park which serves the group practice. Areas surrounding the area would be landscaped, and planted with trees in order to provide some screening to the development.

Currently the area of land which would be developed is quite open, and acts as a buffer strip separating the dwellings fronting Ongar Road from the car parks which serve the doctors surgery and village hall. The land is quite open and provides an open aspect with views out across the playing fields to the Roding Valley.

The introduction of the proposed games area will have a detrimental impact on the visual amenities of the area, being visible not only from the houses in Ongar Road but also by passers-by and users of New Farm Drive which is opposite the site. Furthermore the use of the new pitch is likely to generate noise and disturbance which could detract from the amenities of neighbouring residents. A number of correspondents point out that they are already disturbed by the shouts of footballers using the existing pitches and they anticipate that activities on the new games area would result in similar problems being experienced.

During the course of consideration of this application the Parish Council was asked to consider a possible relocation of the games area to a position behind the village hall. In this location there will be far less of an impact on the visual amenities of the Green Belt; and the use could be supervised from the village hall. There is also a possibility that the floodlights in the hall could be adopted to provide illumination for the play area. This suggestion was considered by the Parish Council but the original location close to Ongar Road was their preference.

Notwithstanding the very laudable reasons for wanting the development it is considered that the long term implications of the location chosen is that it would detract from the visual amenities of the area, and from the Metropolitan Green Belt; and the use would detract from the amenities of residential properties by reason of noise and disturbance.

In these circumstances the application fails to comply with Local Plan policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

42 ONGAR ROAD - Object, this will cause more pollution, noise and rubbish. Will cause loss of privacy and could be a road safety issue.

35 ONGAR ROAD - Concerned about the proximity to this house and to the road. Also the fencing will be visually intrusive and its doubtful that it will prevent errant balls coming into back garden. Increased noise levels from participants and dubious language used. There would also be the impact of lighting if the area were to be floodlit. Would urge the Parish Council to seek a better location for this development.

31 ONGAR ROAD - No objection to the games area but do object to the position. The purpose of this area was as a buffer zone between the car park and the houses to ensure that noise would not disturb residents. We will now have the noise of balls being kicked against the fence panels and players shouting. Notice there are no floodlights but if there were to be some in the future they would be a nuisance to neighbours and a distraction to passing motorists. The area is so close to the road that its possible errant balls could go into the road and cause an accident. What colour is the playing surface and the fencing? It should not be intrusive.

MEADOW VIEW, NEW FARM DRIVE - Do not object to the principal of the play area but do object to the location. It would be right opposite this house and there will be extra noise it will block views of the countryside and increase levels of traffic and pollution. Also opposed to the possibility of having a pedestrian crossing right outside this property. Can see no reason why this should not be located behind the village hall where it would have far less impact on the amenity of neighbours.

29 ONGAR ROAD - Object to the proximity to our property. Extra noise levels. Lack of respect shown to other peoples property, may result in unwanted attention after closing time. Already experience a lot of noise from the existing pitches. Why can't the play area be sited behind the existing hall? The proposed siting is quite inappropriate.

33 ONGAR ROAD - Object because of increased noise levels as the area is to be surfaced. The fencing would be very unsightly and visible from this property. No mention of what colour the surface will be. Would be inappropriate development of a village field. Would not like to see the erosion of green belt land. Too near existing dwellings, why not relocate it away from the houses? It would be in a dangerous position in relation to the road. The proposed location was meant to be retained as an open area between the village hall and the cottages to act as a buffer zone containing trees hedges and landscaping. If the play area were to be floodlit at a later date it could cause more disruption and light pollution. Suggest relocation behind the village hall were there is already drainage lighting etc. It could be supervised and would be screened from neighbours. It could also be built on the land in Pancroft where there is an existing playground.

COMMENTS ON AMENDED PLANS -


31 ONGAR ROAD - Objections remain the same...too close to the houses and to the road.

33 ONGAR ROAD - Still object to noise levels, unsightly fence, to the loss of the buffer zone which should be retained between the village hall and the cottages, inappropriate development of a village field, erosion of green belt, etc. Different locations should be considered

29 ONGAR ROAD - re-affirm previous objections, the relocation is not significant and will still cause the same problems for us. There is a large area behind the small football pitch which is not being used moving the play area here would not present any problems for adjacent residents. Supervision would also be easier from the hall.

35 ONGAR ROAD - concerns previously expressed still apply. Moving the site a few metres east will not make much difference. Its quite possible in the new location that vehicles may be damaged in the car park. This area was originally designated as a landscaping strip when the original planning permission for the Hall was granted.

MEADOW VIEW NEW FARM DRIVE - the changes are so small not to be significant. In fact the play area has in fact been moved closer to this house therefore objections are even stronger. There is ample room behind the hall for this development where it would not affect the neighbours.



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

**Item No: 7**  
**Scale: 1:1250**





---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/2195/04

Report Item No: 8

**SITE ADDRESS:**

WEALD HALL NURSING HOME, WEALD HALL LANE, THORNWOOD,  
NORTH WEALD

**PARISH:** North Weald

**APPLICANT:** Speciality Care Ltd

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Demolition of existing 40 bed nursing home and replacement by  
24 bed independent hospital.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Materials of construction to be agreed.
3. Drainage details to be agreed.
4. Wheel washing equipment to be installed.
5. Submission of Landscape Method Statement
6. Submission of Landscape Maintenance Plan
7. Tree protection measures required.
8. The development, including site clearance, must not commence until a scheme of landscaping and a statement of the methods of implementation have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and are approved in writing. The scheme shall include removal of existing leylandii screening and shall include reinstatement with appropriate alternative native species.

The scheme must include details of the proposed planting including a plan, details of species, stock sizes and numbers/densities where appropriate, and include a timetable for its implementation. If any plant dies, becomes diseased or fails to thrive within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, or is removed, uprooted or destroyed, it must be replaced by another plant of the same kind and size and at the same place unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to a variation beforehand in writing.

The statement must include details of all means by which successful establishment of the scheme will be ensured, including preparation of the planting area, planting methods, watering, weeding, mulching, use of stakes and ties, plant protection and aftercare. It must also include details of the supervision of the planting and liaison with the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping must be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme and statement, unless the Local Planning Authority has given its prior written consent to any variation.

9. After development deliveries and collections to and from the approved development shall only be between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 09.00 - 14.00 hours on Saturdays. No deliveries on Sundays or Bank Holidays (This includes waste collections).
10. Prior to the premises being brought into use for the purposes hereby permitted, a scheme providing for the adequate storage of both clinical and other refuse from this site shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the scheme carried out and thereafter retained at all times.
11. A flood risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to commencement of development. The assessment shall include calculations of increased run-off and associated volume of storm detention using Windes or other similar programme. The approved measures shall be undertaken prior to the first occupation of the building hereby approved and shall be adequately maintained.
12. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the proposed surface materials for the access and parking area shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed surface treatment shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development.
13. Before commencement of any part of the development hereby approved a scheme for the protection of the premises from noise emanating from the adjacent airfield shall be submitted and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such agreed measures shall be put in place before first occupation of any part of the premises.

Description of Proposal:

Demolition of existing 40 bed nursing home and replacement by 24 bed independent hospital, which will provide a safe environment for persons with mild to moderate mental illness or for those recovering from mental health problems on a programme

of rehabilitation.

#### Description of Site:

The application site is situated at the most easterly end of Weald Hall Lane, adjacent the western boundary of North Weald Airfield. Land to the south is open agricultural land (part of Weald Hall Farm) as is land to the north and west.

Access to the site is currently gained via two access points onto Weald Hall Lane and the site is well defined by existing planted boundaries.

The site is currently developed by a collection of single storey and two storey buildings with hardened car parking areas.

#### Relevant History:

EPF/358/76 - Use of dwelling as a residential home for the elderly - Approved.

Various applications thereafter for alterations and extensions.

#### Policies Applied:

##### Structure Plan:-

Metropolitan Green Belt Policies C1 & C2.  
Landscape Conservation NR1, NR4.  
Sustainable New Developments CS1, CS4.  
Hazardous or Noisy Development BE6.  
Development in Rural Settlements and Major Developed Sites in Countryside RE1, RE3.  
Sustainable Transport Policies T1, T3, T12.

##### Local Plan:-

Metropolitan Green Belt Policies GB2, GB7, GB15.  
Recycling & Pollution RP3, RP4, RP5.  
Employment E2, E5, E11.  
Potentially Intrusive Activities RST22.  
North Weald Airfield RST27, RST28.  
Community Facilities CF2, CF3.  
Utilities U1, U2, U3.  
Design DBE1, DBE2, DBE4.  
Landscape LL1, LL2, LL10, LL11.  
Transport T5, T14, T17.

#### Issues and Considerations:

The key issue in relation to this proposal stems from the location of the site within the Green Belt. Appropriateness of

the development and any very special circumstances must be considered and if acceptable in principle the impact the development would have on the landscape, highway network and the area in general including the adjacent airfield.

Green Belt:

Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 (Green Belts) deals specifically with development within the Green Belt stating that the construction of new buildings inside a green belt is inappropriate unless it is for one of the stated purposes and the guidance note goes on to list those developments that are appropriate.

No provision within the guidance allows for new hospital development and it is therefore concluded that this proposal amounts to inappropriate development within the Green Belt.

The Guidance Note states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and that it is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. Very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development will not exist unless the harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

Very Special Circumstances

Both Government Guidance and Structure Plan policy requires all new development to be sustainable, this also applies to the location of new development and is normally assessed by sequential tests.

The applicants in their planning statement in support of the proposal acknowledge that this proposal does not ideally meet such a test since the site is not within a built up settlement or town close to transport and other services.

However, they have argued that a countryside location has greater health benefits than a location in a built up area and where such a development often conflicts with neighbours amenities.

Despite the requirement in policy CF2 that sites should be readily accessible by car and public transport it has been recognized by the Council considering other similar proposals in the district that suitable sites for healthcare facilities are often difficult to find and more often than not are on the fringes of settlements or within the adjacent countryside.

Whilst the somewhat isolated location of this site may not meet a sequential test it would involve development of previously developed land which is also one of the government's important sustainable aims.

The applicants have pointed to other Green Belt policies

concerning redevelopment particularly GB15 (Replacement Dwellings) and to some extent the redevelopment of major developed sites as outlined in PPG2 within which the crucial factor in considering redevelopment is that such development should have no greater impact than the existing development on the openness of the Green Belt.

The applicants argue that this proposal would result in less built development and therefore be of gain to the openness of the area.

Finally the applicants have put forward a pragmatic reason for the redevelopment of this site in arguing that the current care home does not meet current standards and refurbishment would not be practicable or viable.

They have identified an unmet need within this vicinity for accommodation for persons in need of mental health care. This results in numerous individuals having to be accommodated out of the county. This fact is not disputed by the local NHS Trust Mental Health Partnership who have made comment but have raised no specific objections to these proposals.

#### The Scheme and its Impact on the Surroundings

The proposal is to replace the existing nursing home buildings on the site with a specialized 24 bed hospital unit of brick façade and low pitched roof.

The central core of the building will be two storey and have a shallow pitched roof to minimize its impact on the open surrounding landscape. The central core is flanked on each side by single storey wings again with shallow pitched roofs. Essentially the accommodation is arranged around a central courtyard with the two storey element comprising the administration block and services with the single storey elements being three 12-bed en-suite patient accommodation.

The proposal retains the existing boundary planting strengthened by new 2.4 metre high close boarded fencing. With one new relocated access into the site the loss of any planting to create this is to be replaced supplementing the existing site landscaping.

Since the building sits within a fairly level landscape the new structures will be visible but by keeping the building low and with a slight reduction in overall volume the applicants argue the development will have less impact overall on the openness of the area.

This end of Weald Hall Lane is very rural with no nearby neighbours such that amenities will not be harmed.

The current nursing home on the site has provision for 40 beds whereas the replacement facility will accommodate only 24

patients. This, the applicants argue will result in a reduction in traffic. In reality it is not normally the residents or patients that would account for vehicle movement but more likely staff and visitors to the premises. This said, with a reduction in occupants, visitor traffic is likely to be less and even with an increase in staff and medical personnel traffic to and from the site is likely to be lower than the current use and certainly no higher. As such it is unlikely that traffic to the facility would have any greater impact on the site's surroundings, and no specific objection has been raised by the Council's Highways Services.

There is only one neighbour objection to the scheme and that from the adjacent, authority owned, airfield manager.

That objection relates to noise and disturbance but that created by the airfield and its possible impact on the new development. As such there is an expressed opinion that the two uses are not compatible. Whilst this is a reasonable view it could be equally said of the existing use of the site which is in the same use class.

#### Summary

The application site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The erection of a new hospital facility amounts to inappropriate development within the Green Belt. However, there are special factors which can be weighed against the harm to the Green Belt the development would have and are as follows:

The site has been previously developed and has existing buildings on the land. The replacement building is marginally smaller and lower and would, therefore, add to the openness of its surroundings. The potential for improvements to the surrounding landscape by the provision of a replanned and reduced building and to the landscaping of the site from additional planting would improve both long distance views and close up street scene views; and the provision of a modern health care facility for those who suffer mental health problems.

Weighing up all the above factors and the very limited proposals for such health care facilities in the district it is considered that they do give rise to very special circumstances.

The development itself is considered to be well designed and landscaped and will not harm the amenities of any local neighbours. Whilst somewhat remote from any centre of population and therefore, not totally in accordance with development plan policy its distance from the built up centre of Thornwood Village could alleviate any potential amenity concerns. Any further concern regarding its location adjacent the airfield needs to be balanced against the previous long

term existence of the former care home on the site.

## Conclusions

The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the present proposal amounts to inappropriate development which should be resisted unless it is considered that there are very special circumstances which outweigh any harm caused to Green Belt.

Firstly it has to be acknowledged that this is not a green field site but one that is already developed which has a use similar to that proposed. That existing use has the potential to have greater impact on its surroundings because of the size of buildings and the number of occupants and therefore, traffic movements.

Against this, despite one objection to the contrary, officers consider the proposed new building to be well designed and capable of bringing a visual improvement to this rather run down site and to its surroundings generally. The provision of this valuable facility to the district must also be considered.

On balance it is felt that the proposed use would not harm the visual appearance or character of the area and would be likely to bring about positive benefits. That the marginal decrease in building form would aid the openness of the area and that these benefits outweigh the harm caused by allowing inappropriate development.

Accordingly it is recommended that this proposal be approved subject to the conditions set out above.


## **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

PARISH COUNCIL - No objections.

NORTH WEALD AIRFIELD - Development is inappropriate given its proximity to an active runway and taxiway at North Weald Airfield. Airfield also hosts a number of public events, including drag racing and speed trials on the runway, public car shows, funfairs and fireworks all of which are established local community events.

CAMPAIGN TO PROTECT RURAL ESSEX - Object to this application because the hospital design is akin to an office or warehouse and compared to the present building is totally out of keeping with the rural nature of the area.

OBJECTION FROM LEITH PLANNING LIMITED (on behalf of another health care operator) - Objection on the following grounds:- application inaccurately completed, no transport assessment, lack of information, facility should be situated in a sustainable location, will set a precedent and be detrimental to the character of the countryside, contrary to Development Plan policies, no evidence of "material considerations" which justify departure from Development Plan.



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

Item No: 8  
Scale: 1:10,000





---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/93/05

Report Item No: 9

**SITE ADDRESS:**  
224 HIGH ROAD, NORTH WEALD

**PARISH:** North Weald

**APPLICANT:** Mr P A Jeary

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling to form 2 no. three bedroom houses. (One additional dwelling)

**RECOMMENDED DECISION: Grant Permission**

1. To be commenced within 5 years.
2. Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed extension and dwelling shall match those of the existing building.
3. Full details of boundary treatment of both the site as a whole and the individual plots shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. The development, including site clearance, must not commence until a scheme of landscaping and a statement of the methods of implementation have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and are approved in writing.

The scheme must include details of the proposed planting including a plan, details of species, stock sizes and numbers/densities where appropriate, and include a timetable for its implementation. If any plant dies, becomes diseased or fails to thrive within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, or is removed, uprooted or destroyed, it must be replaced by another plant of the same kind and size and at the same place unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to a variation beforehand in writing.

The statement must include details of all means by which successful establishment of the scheme will be ensured, including preparation of the planting area, planting methods, watering, weeding, mulching, use of stakes and ties, plant protection and aftercare. It must also include details of the supervision of the planting and liaison with the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping must be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme

and statement, unless the Local Planning Authority has given its prior written consent to any variation in the first planting season following the completion of the development.

5. Prior to the commencement of the development, details of the proposed surface materials for the access, parking areas and footpaths shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The agreed surface treatment shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development.
6. No further side windows without approval

### Background

This application was previously presented to the Area Plans Sub-Committee on 9 March 2005 when it was resolved to defer making a decision in order to obtain the views of the Council's Design and Conservation Officer on the proposals and in particular to get a view on whether the existing pair of semi-detached houses are appropriate for local listing. The previous report on this application is set out below.

### Opinion of the Council's Design and Conservation Officer

The Council's Design and Conservation Officer states that the existing pair of semi-detached houses did not meet the criteria for local listing since having both previously been altered they were not good original examples of Victorian housing. Furthermore, an examination of Council records reveals that the houses are not on the draft list of buildings to be locally listed agreed in consultation with North Weald Parish Council. In order to carry sufficient weight when assessing proposals for development the criteria for local listing is very stringent. It is used to identify buildings of district-wide importance that could become candidates for inclusion in the national list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest.

Nevertheless, the Design and Conservation Officer has expressed some concerns about the proposal. He noted that, although the houses are situated within an area of mixed character they are in a prominent position with fairly spacious gardens. His view is that if the Council were considering a two storey side extension to this house it would expect the extension to be designed to appear subordinate to the main house and to maintain the character of the original pair of semis (i.e. step-in roofline and set back of building line). Accordingly, he concluded that the design of the proposed side addition and its use as a separate dwelling would give the pair of semi-detached houses an unbalanced appearance and would also have a terracing effect. Both of these impacts were considered

to be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing houses.

The Design and Conservation Officer also took the view that if planning permission were granted in this case the Council would have little justification for resisting a similar proposal at the adjoining property, No. 226 High Road and the consequent further terracing effect this would create would cause additional harm to the character of the area.

#### Further Assessment of the Proposal

In the light of the comments by the Design and Conservation Officer further consideration has been given to the proposal. It is considered that it meets the Local and Structure Plan policy preference for providing housing in urban areas. Furthermore, it accords with Government policy set out in PPG3, Housing (March 2000) which indicates Local Planning Authorities should look for ways to encourage housing development that makes more efficient use of land. Amongst the Government's objectives set out in PPG3 it is stated that Local Planning Authorities should give priority to re-using previously-developed land within urban areas, bringing empty homes back into use and converting existing buildings, in preference to the development of greenfield sites. In doing so the PPG also states that Local Planning Authorities should promote good design in new housing developments.

It is accepted that the proposal would convert a pair of semi-detached houses into a terrace of three. It is considered that given the need for additional housing as emphasised in the strong guidance in PPG3 any justification for the refusal of the proposal on design grounds must clearly outweigh the benefit of the proposal in providing housing in an urban area. In this case the existing pair of semi-detached houses clearly do not meet the criteria for Local Listing therefore they do not merit any special protection in their own right. Moreover, the locality is mixed in character and by repeating the design of the existing house the resulting development would not appear as an unbalanced pair of semi-detached houses but as a terrace of three. For the reasons stated in the previous report the creation of the terrace would not be harmful to the character of the locality. Since the proposal is clearly intended to provide an additional house it is not considered appropriate to assess it as an extension to a house.

Since the appearance of the terrace of three houses that would be created by the proposal is considered to be acceptable and is also considered to be acceptable in terms of the mixed character of the locality it accords with planning policy at all levels. In coming to this view significant weight is given to the general need for more housing and the strong preference for providing it within urban areas.

Accordingly it is still recommended that planning permission be granted.

## REPORT CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING HELD ON 9TH MARCH 2005

### Description of Proposal:

This application is for the erection of 1 dwelling comprising a three bedroom house and for a part single, part two storey rear extension to the existing house that would include the provision of an additional bedroom.

The single storey rear extension would project 2.7m on the boundary with the adjoining house, No. 226 High Road and be 2.7m wide. The two storey rear addition would project 3m, the same depth as an existing single storey rear extension to No. 226, for the remaining width of the rear elevation. Both extensions would have pitched roofs matching the design of the existing main roof to the house.

The new house would be built as a part single, part two storey side addition to the existing house as extended and in design terms would essentially repeat the existing house. One off-street car parking place would be provided in the front garden of the existing and proposed house with the remainder of the front garden landscaped. The rear garden of the existing house would be subdivided along the line of the flank wall to the existing house and existing outbuildings would be demolished.

### Description of Site:

The site is 0.03 hectares and currently accommodates one of a pair of two storey semi-detached houses together with a wide side garden area occupied by ancillary outbuildings. It is located off a lay-by on the southeast side of High Road, east of its junctions with Thornhill and School Green Lane. The site is situated in a residential area. A field in agricultural use is situated to the rear of the site.

The existing house is not listed and the site is not within a Conservation Area. The High Road itself is a busy main road designated the B181 that links the nearby A414 to Epping, which attracts traffic that passes through North Weald from a wide area.

### Relevant History:

None.

## Policies Applied:

### Structure Plan:

- CS1 - Achieving sustainable urban regeneration
- CS2 - Protecting the natural and built environment
- CS4 - Sustainable new development
- BE1 - Urban intensification
- H2 - Housing development - The sequential approach
- H3 - Location of residential development
- H4 - Development form of new residential developments
- T3 - Promoting accessibility
- T7 - Road hierarchy
- T8 - Improvements to the primary route network
- T12 - Vehicle parking

### Local Plan:

- H3 - Residential development
- DBE1 - Design of new buildings
- DBE2 - Impact of buildings on neighbouring property
- DBE3 - Development in urban areas
- DBE6 - Car parking
- DBE8 - Private amenity space
- DBE9 - Impact of development on amenity
- DBE10 - residential extensions
- LL11 - Landscaping schemes
- T17 - Highways: Criteria for assessing proposals

## Issues and Considerations:

The development complies with the policy preference for providing new dwellings within existing urban areas with good access to community facilities as set out in national planning guidance and adopted planning policy for the locality. Accordingly, the principle of the erection of a new dwelling is considered acceptable and the main issues to be considered in this case are the acceptability of the form of the development, including the proposed rear extensions to the existing house, its impact on amenity and impact on highway safety.

The site is within an established residential area characterised by a mix of predominantly two storey housing in varying plot sizes and in the form of detached, semi-detached and terraced housing, all of which can be found within a short distance of the site. Given this context, the fact that the new dwelling would repeat the design of the existing house and would be set at least 1m from the site boundary with No. 218 High Road it is considered that it would respect the character of the area.

With specific regard to the fact that the proposal would turn a pair of semi-detached houses into a terrace of three houses, this is considered to be entirely appropriate in this context. Indeed, a short terrace sharing the same main characteristics

of the terrace that would be created by this proposal can be found at Nos. 204-210 High Road, a short distance to the west. The main characteristics shared with the proposal are that the terrace is comprised of two storey houses with similar plot widths, similar set back from front garden boundaries and similar set in of the end of terrace houses from side garden boundaries.

Compared to other properties fronting the High Road the situation of the site is unique in one respect: it does not front the main carriageway of the High Road but is off a lay-by serving Nos. 216 to 228 (even) High Road. This means that a greater amount of on-street parking area is available compared to other properties fronting the High Road on which parking is generally not permitted. In addition, both the existing and proposed dwelling would have one off-street parking space in accordance with adopted vehicle parking standards. When originally submitted the proposal indicated two parking spaces per dwelling in each front garden but the applicants were asked to reduce the number of spaces to one in order to soften the appearance of the development.

Amenity space provision for the resulting dwellings is considered to be ample. Each rear garden would face southwest and would not be overshadowed by any nearby structures therefore they would receive good light during daylight hours throughout the year. They are a usable shape with the garden for the proposed house having an area of 80 square metres whilst the remaining garden for the existing house would be 54 square metres. It is considered that these gardens would be very usable and appropriate to the size of house they would serve, particularly bearing in mind the open land at the rear.

Given the ample provision of amenity space and off-street parking, good set in from the boundary with No. 218 High Road and generally acceptable appearance of the proposed development it is considered that there is no justification for describing it as an over-development of the site.

In terms of the impact on amenity, it is considered that the proposed rear extensions would not have any adverse impact on the adjoining house, No. 226 High Road. Due to their limited rearward projection, set-in of the two storey addition from the boundary and having regard to the southerly aspect of the properties together with the presence of a single storey rear extension to No. 226 the additions would have no adverse impact on light and certainly would not appear overbearing.

The proposed new house would project 3.5m forward of the front main wall of No. 218 High Road but its flank wall would be set 3.7m away from the nearest corner of No. 218. Since the forward projection of the proposed house would be entirely set outside a 45 degree line taken from the nearest corner of No. 218 the staggered relationship between the two houses would not appear overbearing when seen from No. 218.

Furthermore, because of this acceptable relationship and given the northerly aspect of the front elevations of the two properties, the proposed house would not cause any excessive loss of light to No. 218.

The absence of flank windows in either the extension or the new house means that the proposed development would not give rise to any unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring residential properties.

#### Conclusion

The proposed development is a good design that respects the established local character, makes good use of urban land whilst not being of such an intensity as to preclude the provision of a good standard of amenity space provision and landscaping, all of which would be well provided for.

Furthermore, the proposal has been successfully designed to safeguard the amenities enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed development therefore complies with national planning guidance and adopted planning policy for the locality and accordingly conditional planning permission should be granted.

#### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

**PARISH COUNCIL - Objection.** Members considered concerns raised by Mr A Sword, a local resident. Members concluded that the proposal represented overdevelopment and would not be in keeping with the existing street scene. The impact on the amenity for neighbouring properties principally because of the loss of garden areas and overshadowing was unreasonable. Members concluded that the application was not consistent with the requirements of policies DBE2 and DBE9 of the adopted Local Plan.

**NEIGHBOURS -** The occupiers of 3 neighbouring properties, 218 High Road, 226 High Road and New Cottage, Skips Corner, High Road raised the following objections to the proposal:

1. The houses built on "Skips Corner" are well spaced out and the new house would give this part of the road a cramped appearance.
2. Parking facilities at present are very good but another house would cause parking problems.
3. Noise, mess and inconvenience during building works.
4. Any additional house will have an affect on the resources supplied to this area i.e. water, electricity etc.
5. The 2 cottages, known as "Skips Cottages" are old farm style houses, they are historic and play a part in keeping the character of North Weald village alive. Constantly adding new houses to our village is taking the character

away and should not be permitted.

6. Nos. 224 and 226 High Road are a pair of symmetrical semi-detached cottages and the proposal would give an asymmetric appearance to the structure which will be ugly, unbalanced and odd.

7. This area is characterised by houses with substantial gaps between them and since the new house would fill the gap adjacent to No. 224 High Road it will have a negative effect on the appearance of the area.

8. The pair of semi-detached cottages are a local landmark. They were built in the 19th Century and still retain the original appearance and any fundamental change has to be considered a bad thing.

9. The pair of cottages are right-sized, in proportion and appropriate to the area but the new terraced configuration would be excessively bulky, overbearing and out of scale compared to the surrounding properties particularly as the cottages are high fronted.

10. The proposal would adversely affect the structural integrity of both of the pair of houses since the new structure would have deeper footings and this will lead to subsidence and potential damage.

11. Increased noise and disturbance due to additional inhabitants.

12. Increased noise and pollution from additional motor vehicles generated by the development.

13. The development is unnecessary given that several similar sized properties are for sale within the village boundary.

14. Overshadowing of the front elevation of No. 218 High Road.





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

Item No: 9  
Scale: 1:1250



---

**APPLICATION No:** EPF/2293/04

Report Item No: 10

**SITE ADDRESS:**  
17 THE WEIND, THEYDON BOIS

**PARISH:** Theydon Bois

**APPLICANT:** Mr G Symes

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**  
Single storey side and rear extensions.

**RECOMMENDED DECISION:** Grant Permission

1. To be commenced within 5 years.

2. Materials shall match existing.

Description of Proposal:

Consent is being sought for single storey side and rear extensions. The side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the property by some 7.5m and, behind, a conservatory would project for a further 5.65m. Both extensions would be set off the boundary with No. 16 by 800mm.

Description of Site:

Two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south west side of The Weind. The property has been extended previously in the form of a side dormer window and an erection of a carport extending along the side of the property. There is a large detached garage to the rear of No. 16 adjacent to the boundary. On the boundary with No. 18, lies a mature yew hedge providing generous screening.

Relevant History:

None

Policies Applied:

DBE9 and DBE10 - Residential Development Policies

## Issues and Considerations:

The main issues here relate to the potential impact of the proposal on the amenities of the neighbouring properties and the design in relation to the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

### Amenity

The side extension is a minor addition to the property and would have no material impact on the neighbouring property. The conservatory whilst relatively deep at 5.65m would be screened predominantly by the detached garage at No. 16 and would create no real loss of amenity to that neighbour. In relation to No. 18, the conservatory would be set some 2.75m away from the common boundary. It is considered that this separation combined with the generous screening between the plots is sufficient to ensure that any loss of amenity is minimal.

### Design

Whilst the side extension would be finished with a flat roof, it would be set some 13m back from the pavement and would have very little impact on the street scene. The conservatory, admittedly whilst deep would not dominate the rear of the property due to the generous garden depth and its size is softened by the large detached garage at No. 16. The Parish Council add that previous applications for conservatories have been restricted to less than 4m, however each application has to be treated on its own merits and the circumstances of this site support a larger extension than might be acceptable elsewhere. A front elevation showing the height of the extension has been submitted in response to comments made regarding this.

### Conclusion:

Despite the representation made, the application is recommended for approval on the particular merits of this proposal on this site.

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:**

PARISH COUNCIL - Objection - The scale of the proposed conservatory is excessive in relation to this property. We are concerned over the flat roof on the side extension, which detracts from the appearance from the street. If the existing lean-to also remains, this will further detract from the appearance of the property. We believe previous applications for a conservatory have been restricted to less than 4m. The new extension, taken back to the original building line, is excessive. We note the plans do not appear to correctly show

the height of the roof on the conservatory, which would clearly be visible from the street.



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

Item No: 10  
Scale: 1:1250



This page is intentionally left blank