

Mr M Rahman  
Planning Department  
Epping Forest District Council

15 June 2021

Dear Mr Rahman

**PLANNING APPLICATION EPF/0930/21  
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT DWELLING  
LITTLE OAKS, ABRIDGE ROAD, THEYDON BOIS RM4 1 TX**

I note that the parish council has objected to the above proposal. I address each of the parish council's comments as follows:

1. **PC senses replacement significantly larger than existing.**

The figures are:

	Footprint sqm	Volume cubm	Height m
existing	175	919	7.6
proposed	192	1150	7.3
% change	+9%	+25%	-4%

A small increase in the footprint of only 9% and volume of 25% is not material in the context of the site and surroundings. The height would be slightly reduced from the existing height.

2. **PC states that permitted garage/gym could not serve as garage owing to lack of space for driveway.**

There is a 4m space to the side to allow access to the permitted garage/gym, if it were to be built.

3. **PC states that proposal visually materially larger, more prominent than existing, lack of screening from public highway.**

With the slightly reduced ridge height and small increase in built form, the proposal would not appear visually materially larger than the existing house and would not be prominent owing to the design and existing mature screening to the road frontage. The proposal allows for significant gaps to the sides of the house, positioning the replacement centrally across the width of the plot and creating space around the sides. The space to the sides and the fact that the replacement would be sited further back into the plot than existing, increases the sense of openness, to the benefit of the Green Belt.



*Little Oaks - existing mature screening to road frontage.*

4. PC states that proposal would be dominant whereas Countisbury has a more modest presence in the street scene.

The proposal would not be an unduly dominant feature in the street scene, being only slightly greater in volume than existing, slightly lower in height, further back into the site, with spaces to the sides, and with good screening to the road frontage. Countisbury, by contrast, has a far greater bulk and together with large outbuildings, presents a greater massing with greater prominence in the street scene than the proposal.



*Countisbury and outbuilding – bulk and massing – lack of screening to road frontage.*



The same is true for Highview, for which planning permission was granted in 2005 (EPF/0134/05). Both Countisbury and Highview have far greater bulk and massing, and a far greater impact on openness, than the proposal.



*Countisbury (south) and Highview (north).*

5. PC states that application EPF/0413/19 for extensions to Little Oaks was refused owing to the impact on the Green Belt, and that the size and scale of the current proposal is visually more dominant than the proposed extensions. The application for extensions was refused because national policy requires that extensions to buildings in the Green Belt must not be disproportionately larger than the original building. Although the extensions failed to meet the policy requirement regarding additions to the original building, the Council determined that the design was acceptable, extensions were subservient which complemented the house, the extensions were of modest form and design and were consistent with the established character of the locality. The proposal would have no greater impact and would not be more visually

dominant than the proposed extensions, which were found to be acceptable in visual terms.

The proposal would comply with national and local planning policies and it is therefore requested that planning permission for the replacement dwelling be granted.

Yours sincerely

Mrs G Davidson BA(Hons) MRTPI

---

Gillian Davidson BA(Hons) MRTPI