

Proposal

This application is for revised proposals following refusal Ref: PL/EPF/0052/21 (dated 25 Feb 2021)

Part single/two storey rear extensions, replacement larger roof window on rear elevation, conversion of rear half of existing garage.

Reasons for refusal

*“The existing extensions & proposed development by reason of its design, excessive scale, bulk & siting would cumulatively subsume the character and appearance of the existing dwelling house. As such, the development would result in a disproportionate and obtrusive development that is unsympathetic and have a detrimental impact on the character of the property and the surrounding locality.”*

Within the officers report under the heading “Description of Site” it refers to the property as having “a 2-storey rear extension sited to the east elevation of the property.”

- There appears to have been a misunderstanding when assessing the plans, as the property has not been extended in any way since the original construction. Under the heading “Relevant History” it even states “None”, which is correct, therefore reference to any existing extensions within the report and in particular reasons for refusal is not factually correct or applicable.

For reference and to confirm the original layout, some of the developers drawings have been included with this application as separate attachments.

Issues for Consideration – design & size of the development

The report states *“The existing extensions and proposed internal floor area of the proposed development would amount to a floor area of some 126sqm, in comparison to the original floor area which also amounts to a floor area of 126sqm. The development would be greater than the footprint of the original dwellinghouse and is considered cumulatively unacceptable.”*

- These comments have also been written out of context due to the apparent misunderstanding. For the avoidance of doubt and to clarify the floor areas based on the revised proposals:

**Original internal floor area** (not including garage)

Ground Floor = 72.8sqm    First Floor = 67.5sqm    Second Floor = 43.4sqm    Total = 183.7sqm

**Proposed extensions**

Ground Floor = 27.5sqm    First Floor = 19.9sqm    Total = 47.4sqm

**Percentage increase = 25.8%**

The proposed single storey extension has been reduced in width by 3.3m and 0.2m in depth and the pitched roof light replaced with a flat glazed version so that it remains below the parapet height.

The first floor (two storey element) has been reduced in size and set back 0.6m from the original rear wall to offer some visual relief/interest and separate the original/proposed building, and the overall roof height is set 0.3m below the original rear 2 storey hipped roof. The proposed roof will also be 4m below that of the main gable end ridge.

The proposed extensions are therefore subordinate in scale and form to the main dwellinghouse and of a reduced width than the main dwellinghouse.

### Impact on Neighbours Amenities

It is noted within the report that the previous proposals would not result in any undue harmful amenity implications, and these revised proposals do not include any alterations to change that.

It is worth highlighting that the nearest property (No.9 Boleyn Row) has a larger square footprint without the staggered two storey section at the rear and the roof spans the full depth front to back. The proposed first floor rear wall will be set behind that of the main 2 storey rear wall at No. 9, and considering there are no windows in the side elevation of No.9, there will be no overlooking or loss of natural light for the occupants.

### Neighbours Comments

These appear to be mostly unfounded and not based on any factual information or standards (such as the apparent 45% increase in size, parking congestion, overlooking 7 properties, etc).

### Epping Town Council Comments

*“This development would affect the streetscene, creating a terracing effect on the particularly styled detached houses on Boleyn Row on the Kings Wood Park estate.”*

- The proposed extensions are at the rear only, contained within the width of the original building and the main streetscene from Boleyn Row remains unaffected.

*“This development would result in a loss of amenities for neighbouring properties in terms of loss of natural light, overlooking, privacy, noise and visual impact.”*

- It has already been noted that the case officer had no concerns with the previous proposals in terms of impact on neighbours amenities. The proposals actually contain improvements, such as the removal/obscuring of 5 windows within side elevations which currently could be considered to cause overlooking issues. There is only 1 clear glazed bedroom window proposed that directly overlooks the side of No. 3 King Henrys Walk, which contains no windows or doors.

*“The loss of part of the garage would also have an impact as there is already a major issue with car parking on that street.”*

- The existing driveway can accommodate 4 vehicles if required (refer to drawings) and a full sized space is retained within the garage. There are no additional bedrooms proposed, only the enlargement of one, so the parking requirements are not relevant regardless of how many spaces currently exist.

### Conclusion

These revised proposals attempt to address previous issues, where relevant, and the proposed extensions when considered in relation to the original property are therefore considered to be of good design, an acceptable scale, bulk and siting that would be subservient to and enhance the character and appearance of the existing property. They would also result in a development that respects the existing building form, sympathetic to the character of the property and the surrounding locality.