

Report to District Development Control Committee

Date of meeting: 5 August 2008

Subject: Planning Application EPF/2358/07- 92 Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey



**Epping Forest
District Council**

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

Recommendation(s):

That Members consider Planning Application EPF/2358/07 for the erection of a two storey side extension to create annexe accommodation for two family members, at 92 Crooked Mile, Waltham Abbey, deferred from the last meeting to enable the applicant to address parking and land ownership issues.

Report :

1. (Head of Planning and Economic Development) Members will recall that this application was brought before them on 3 June 2008 with a recommendation for approval subject to following conditions:
 - (1) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.
 - (2) The proposed extension shall only be used as ancillary accommodation for the existing dwelling house and shall not be occupied as a unit separately from the dwelling known as 92 Crooked Mile.
 - (3) Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed extension shall match those of the existing building.
 - (4) A flood risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA 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 extension hereby approved and shall be adequately maintained in accordance with a management plan to be submitted concurrently with the assessment.

The original report is attached and the Officer recommendations remain unchanged.

2. Members were concerned that the scheme may not provide adequate on site parking for the size and nature of the development and also requested that a land ownership issue raised by neighbours was addressed.
3. The applicant has submitted an amended site plan showing a reduced site area (omitting the disputed area to the front of the site) and indicating the provision of three parking spaces within the site (one within the existing garage and two within the rear garden area), together with a turning area. Access to this parking area is to be

taken through the existing double garage. The applicant has also submitted drawings showing the proposed alterations to the garage to achieve this.

4. These amendments came in on different dates so neighbours were reconsulted twice. At the time of writing the consultation period relating to the amendment to the garage has not expired and any additional comments received will be reported orally at committee.

5. Finally it was suggested by Members that a condition could be attached that would restrict the use of the extended dwelling to C3 use (Dwellinghouse) This description includes use by “not more than 6 residents living together as a single household (including a household in which care is provided for residents)” The applicant has stated that he is happy to accept any normal conditions deemed necessary.

6. The representations, in respect of the amendments, so far received are summarised below:

1 HERWARD CLOSE – Although change of use is not applied for the title suggests change of use to a “care unit” we object to this implied change of use. The annexes could be used as separate flats or apartments, which would be unacceptable. The personal circumstances of the applicant’s daughters should be irrelevant. The applicant does not say his daughters will live there. The building will appear bulky, overbearing and out of scale. Is adequate garden area retained? The plans are unclear, what will the garage look like?

4 HERWARD CLOSE – Overbearing, inappropriate and out of scale with the residential area. These are self contained flats, that once built can be sold off. The last two applications were for a care home, there is still doubt that this is purely residential, may become a care home in time to the detriment of all residents. There is no elevation drawing of the garage. Three parking spaces are not enough for this massive development; two are needed for the applicant and his wife leaving only one for the two self-contained flats and carers etc. The proposal will cause traffic congestion and confusion in the turning area in front of the access. There is insufficient parking in the close already. The development will lead to additional traffic, pollution and noise and change the quiet cul de sac.

96 CROOKED MILE- Our earlier objections are still valid. Additional objections. The plans are inaccurate and provide inadequate detail. The site area is still being described as .078 hectare (approx) even though the boundary line has changed. Sizes of the car parking spaces are not indicated on the drawings. The application is still for a commercial use and should therefore be submitted on the appropriate application form not as a residential extension.

A further letter from 96 Crooked Mile raises the following issues. Change of use is proposed, should not be treated as householder application. The land edged in blue is not in the applicant’s ownership; notice should have been served on the owner. The development proposed results in development akin to a terrace of three dwellings in bulk, out of character with the area contrary to policies of the Local plan. The development is designed as three self contained units County standards advocate 5 spaces, only 3 are proposed There is no visibility splay at the access causing hazard to highway safety. Cycle storage should be provided. Contrary to ST4 and 6 and PPG3. The design and access statement inadequately addresses flooding, suggests raised thresholds, this would be contrary to building regs. And

disabled access requirements. A smaller extension and more imaginative use of existing space could result in a more acceptable solution.

90 CROOKED MILE – Still object to two self contained flats. Adverse visual impact of overlarge property, out of keeping and scale. Plans still state “care unit”, this will mean carers and helpers will be needed 24/7. The three spaces proposed are inadequate. The spaces are not clear on the plans and there are no proposed elevations. Concerned about increased traffic using this turning point. There is already inadequate parking in the cul de sac; visitors have to park in the close, as there is no parking on Crooked Mile.

2 HEReward CLOSE – The proposal is overbearing out of character and out of scale with adjacent properties and is for two self contained flats not an annexe. This is a development project; the intention is as before to create a care unit. This should be refused. The building is in a flood risk area. Three parking spaces are inadequate for the house and two flats, plus carers and visitors; there are no details of the garage. The additional traffic will cause hazard and congestion. The car parking spaces encroach on the garden amenity area. There is a sub station in my garden and any buildings must be 7 metres away. The development will adversely affect privacy of No 96 Crooked Mile. Planting trees close to that property will not be helpful. The development should be refused, as its future use cannot be controlled.