

# **Report to District Development Control Committee**



**Epping Forest  
District Council**

**Date of meeting: 5 August 2008**

**Subject: Planning Application EPF/0949/08 – 67 Hoe Lane, Abridge – Removal of Boiler Room and additions to Existing Dwelling (Revised Application).**

**Officer contact for further information:  
Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249**

---

## **Recommendation:**

**That the committee considers planning application EPF/0949/08 at 67 Hoe Lane, Abridge for the removal of Boiler Room and additions to existing dwelling (revised application) which has been referred to DDCC by Area Plans Sub-Committee East without a recommendation.**

## **Report Detail**

1. (Director of Planning and Economic Development) This application has been referred by the Area Plans Sub Committee East without a recommendation. There was a split vote at their meeting on 10 July 2008 and the Chairman did not make a final vote, but instead referred the matter to District Development Control Committee (DDDC). This was supported by four Members of East Committee. The report to the sub-committee carried a recommendation from officers to refuse planning permission and the planning merits of the case are attached.

## **Planning Issues**

2. The debate at the sub-committee meeting centred mainly on the fact that the extensions to this already previously extended house would or would not harm the open character of the Green Belt. Because of its size, the proposals, plus extensions previously added to the original house, would amount to an increase of 119% over the floorspace of the original bungalow. Policy GB14A of the Adopted Local Plan states that the increase should not result in more than 40% up to a maximum of 50 square metres.

3. The additions are therefore clearly inappropriate development in Green Belt terms, but those Members in support considered that there were very special circumstances, that outweighed this in principle Green Belt harm. The case put forward was that the extensions improved the design of the house, despite the increase in size, and that there was other example's, one being two properties away at no.63, in the vicinity where bungalows have been extensively added to and this precedent should be taken into account. This immediate neighbour example was granted planning permission before Local plan policy changes were made to Policy GB14 in July 2006, when it became policy GB14A.

4. There are three parts to Policy GB14A, the first two of which states that existing dwellings may be permitted where *(i) the open character and appearance of the green belt will not be impaired and (ii) the character and appearance of the*

*buildings in their settings will be enhanced or not unduly harmed.* If the DDC Members consider that the proposal satisfies these two parts, then the judgement has to be made on whether these outweigh the third part which states: *(iii) they will not result in disproportionate additions of more than 40%, up to a maximum of 50m<sup>2</sup>, over and above the total floorspace of the original building.* It was the introduction of this final part, no. (iii), that was the main change from GB14 to GB14A.

5. Officer's view is that in this case, is that whilst a judgement can be made on this policy, particularly the first two criteria, the proposal is so far in excess of the 40%, that the very special circumstances of design and precedent does not outweigh Green belt harm. This also differs from the example at no.63, because this is a proposal to create a full two storey with a roof void over whilst no.63 has been extended from an original modest bungalow by adding a first floor that partly goes into the void of the roof. There is no objection to the overall design, but it fails because of Green Belt harm.

### **Conclusion**

6. Should the Committee grant planning permission it should be subject to conditions requiring matching external materials, removal of permitted development on outbuildings and obscure glazing a bedroom window to the north facing, first floor flank wall looking towards no.65.