

**Report to District Development Control
Committee**

Date of meeting: 7 December 2010



**Epping Forest
District Council**

**Subject: Planning Application EPF/1898/10 – Brambles, Epping Road,
Broadley Common, Essex, EN9 2DH – Proposed extension to north
of existing property and in-fill extension to south of existing
property. (Revised application)**

Officer contact for further information: M-C Tovey

Committee Secretary: S Hill Ext 4249

Recommendation:

**That the committee considers the recommendation of the Area Plans
subcommittee West to grant planning permission subject to the following
suggested conditions:**

**1. The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the
expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice.**

**Reason:- To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town
and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).**

**2. Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed
development shall match those of the existing building, unless
otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

Reason:- To safeguard the visual amenities of the locality.

**3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning
General Permitted Development Order 1995 as amended (or any other
order revoking, further amending or re-enacting that order) no
development generally permitted by virtue of Part 1, Class A, B, C and E
shall be undertaken without the prior written permission of the Local
Planning Authority.**

**Reason:- The development is recognised as being contrary to policy as
it does not constitute a 'limited extension' under policy GB2A, and
therefore restrictions over further additions and alterations are required.**

**4. No development shall take place until details of surface water
drainage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local
Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented in
accordance with such agreed details.**

**Reason:- To ensure satisfactory provision and drainage of surface water
in the interests of public health.**

5. If any tree, shrub or hedge shown to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars is removed, uprooted or destroyed, or dies, or becomes severely damaged or diseased within 3 years of the completion of the development, another tree, shrub or hedge of the same size and species shall be planted within 3 months at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation. If within a period of five years from the date of planting any replacement tree, shrub or hedge is removed, uprooted or destroyed, or dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective another tree, shrub or hedge of the same species and size as that originally planted shall, within 3 months, be planted at the same place.

Reason:- To comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as well as to safeguard the amenity of the existing trees, shrubs or hedges and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

Report

1. This application has been referred by the Area Plans Sub Committee West with a recommendation for approval. The report to the sub-committee carried a recommendation from officers to refuse planning permission and the officer's report is reproduced in full below.

Planning Issues

2. The debate at the sub-committee meeting centred on the recommended reasons for refusal and the definition of 'limited extension' with regards to the Green Belt.
3. The sub-committee considered that the size of the proposed extension was acceptable, however accepted that this would be contrary to policy as it did not constitute a 'limited extension'.

Conclusion

4. Whilst the proposal is recommended for approval by Area Plans Sub-committee West the planning officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission still stands. This is because the proposed development is considered inappropriate development and is unacceptable by reason of its size, design and siting being visually intrusive within the Green Belt.
5. Notwithstanding the above, should the Committee grant planning permission it is recommended that this be subject to the above suggested conditions.

ORIGINAL PLANS SUBCOMMITTEE WEST REPORT

Recommended reasons for refusal:

1. The site is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The proposed development is at odds with Government advice and policy GB2A of the Adopted Local Plan and Alterations, in that it does not constitute a limited extension to an existing dwelling. This proposal is inappropriate development which is by definition harmful. The proposed extension combined with the previous additions represent disproportionate additions over and above the original dwelling. Furthermore, no very special circumstances have been submitted that would outweigh the harm to the Metropolitan Green Belt.

This application is before this Committee since it has been 'called in' by Councillor Penny Smith (Pursuant to Section P4, Schedule A (h) of the Council's Delegated Functions).

Description of Proposal:

Proposed extension to north of existing property and in-fill extension to south of existing property (revised application).

Description of Site:

Brambles is a detached bungalow with rooms within the roof space located within a large plot. The property is within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Nazeing and South Roydon Conservation Area. The property is within the small built up enclave of Broadley Common and sits back from the main road by approximately 75m, located behind the neighbouring property Gransden. The property was originally built as an agricultural workers dwelling and has had several extensions in the past.

Relevant History:

EPF/0080/10 – Bungalow – App/Con
EPF/0459/76 – Erection of ground floor extension and alterations and the construction of dormer windows – App/Con
EPF/ 0635/03 – Certificate of lawfulness for existing use of occupation of dwelling without compliance with agricultural occupancy condition – Lawful
EPF/0662/10 – Proposed extension to north of existing property and in-fill extension to south of existing property – Withdrawn
EPF/0663/10 – Conservation area consent for the demolition and removal of loft conversion and associated dormer windows, carport, sauna, utility room, greenhouses and outdoor swimming pool and raised surround – Withdrawn
EPF/1904/10 – Conservation area consent for the demolition and removal of loft conversion and associated dormer windows, carport, sauna, utility room, greenhouses and outdoor swimming pool and raised surround (revised application) – Concurrent Application

Policies Applied:

Epping Forest District Local Plan and Alterations

CP2 – Protecting the Quality of the Rural and Built Environment
GB2A – Development within the Green Belt

DBE9 – Impact on Amenity
DBE10 – Extensions to Dwellings
DBE4 – Design within the Green Belt
LL10 – Retention of Landscaping
HC6 – Character, Appearance and Setting of Conservation Areas
HC7 – Development within Conservation Areas

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS:

ROYDON PARISH COUNCIL: No objection
NEIGHBOURS
9 properties were consulted and a site notice erected
No responses received

Issues and Considerations:

The main issues that arise with this application are considered to be the following:

- Impact on the Metropolitan Green Belt
- Amenity of Neighbouring Properties
- Design and Conservation Issues
- Retention of Landscaping

Impact on the Metropolitan Green Belt

Policy GB2A states that 'limited extensions' within the green belt may be appropriate. This property has been extended in the past and the current proposal seeks to remove some of these extensions whilst adding further extensions and increasing the roof height over part of the existing building.

The proposal, along with earlier additions to the property adds approximately 230m² of additional floorspace above the original dwelling as built in the 1950's, this figure has included the removal of some of the existing extensions as proposed. This figure results in a percentage increase of approximately 187%. The application site is relatively well screened from view by the neighbouring property, Gransden, however the increase height of the carport area will become more clearly visible. This increase in floor area and built form is not considered acceptable inline with policy GB2A as it can not be classed as a limited extension.

This proposal is also accompanied by a Conservation Area Consent application for the demolition of an existing glasshouse, along with existing swimming pool and hardstanding. The glasshouse has a floor area of approximately 90m² and the removal of this is considered an improvement to the open character of the green belt and wider area. However, the pool area is effectively an area of hardstanding albeit raised and the pool wall is something that can be built under permitted development and therefore although the removal of the greenhouse is an improvement the overall removal of these areas is not considered to carry sufficient weight to outweigh the harm caused to the Metropolitan Green Belt in respect of the large amount of additions to the main house.

The application was accompanied by a design and access statement and as part of this statement the agent has suggested that the applicant would accept the removal of permitted development rights should this application be granted. However, this is not considered an acceptable compromise given the amount of existing and

proposed extensions to the main dwelling. In any event it is considered that the removal of the existing garage and carport (although there is plenty of off-road space for the parking of cars) may result in further pressure on the green belt if the current or future occupiers of the site require garaging.

The design and access statement also draws attention to an application that was approved in 2010 for two new properties at Silcocks Farm, as justification for allowing this current application. This application was considered acceptable based on its special circumstances relating to the history of the site. Two new residential dwellings at Silcocks Farm were originally given approval in the 1980's and planning permission was continually renewed. Because of this history it was not considered reasonable for the Council to refuse permission after 25 years of considering the proposal acceptable. The proposal at Silcocks Farm is contrary to existing green belt policy, however the history of the site proved to be considered special circumstance to overcome this. The special circumstances at Silcocks Farm are unique to this site and not transferable to this case, nor has it considered to have set a precedent for any inappropriate green belt development in the locality.

Amenity of Neighbouring Properties

The nearest neighbour to the application site is Gransden located to the north of the site with some 20m between the proposal and the shared boundary. Although the roof height will be greater, due to the existing planting at the shared boundary it is not considered that the proposal will result in any detrimental loss of amenity to this property.

Design and the Conservation Area

This proposal is for a large extension which includes incorporating the existing link and bedrooms into the main part of the house with an enlarged roof. The proposals are considered to consolidate the appearance of the house by removing the appearance of so many additions. This is a relatively modern house within the Conservation Area and the Conservation Officer has no objection to the proposals as they are not considered detrimental to the appearance of the Conservation Area.

Retention of Landscaping

The proposal does not include the removal of any trees on site. However, the application site is within the Conservation Area where all trees are afforded a level of protection. The Tree and Landscape Office has no objection to the proposal subject to a condition ensuring protection of the trees at the rear of Gransden which currently provide a relatively effective level of screening.

Conclusion:

The proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to design, neighbouring amenity, landscaping and impact on the Conservation Area, however the size of the proposals coupled with the existing extensions are considered detrimental to the character and openness of the green belt in this location and therefore not considered in accordance with current green belt policy. It is therefore recommended that planning permission is refused.