

Amended Plans

- 210.1.1 EPF/2502/20 - Land and Garages, Chequers Road Site B, Loughton, Essex, IG10 3QF. Proposal: Erection of one residential building, accommodating 8 flats with associated parking spaces and landscaping.
** SAC case now progressing ** – Min no 1.1 (30/11/2020)**

The Committee reiterated its previous comments which were:

The Committee NOTED the contents of a letter of objection.

The Committee OBJECTED to this application on the following grounds:

- i) By reason of its height, bulk, material and design, the proposal was out of keeping with the street scene, where there were conventional two storey houses with ridged roofs.*
- ii) While appreciating that there were no residences on the ground floor, to mitigate the identified flood risk, there was concern at the potential for anti-social behaviour in the proposed stores at ground floor level.*
- iii) Members were concerned for the privacy of neighbours in the adjacent properties caused by overlooking from the rear balconies.*
- iv) The plans appeared to show 4 (possibly 6) parking spaces for 4 x one-bed flats and 4 x two-bed flats. This would be inadequate unless there was a plan not to allow car ownership and the spaces were only for visitors, deliveries etc. Parking in this road was already problematic and would be exacerbated by this proposal.*
- v) While noting approval had previously been granted, under EPF/2609/15, for 5 x 2 bed two storey affordable homes with 10 parking spaces and associated landscaping, this new proposal would adversely affect the Special Area for Conservation. The Committee believes that this development, alone or in conjunction with others, may have an adverse effect on the Epping Forest Special Area of Conservation. Accordingly, the Committee believes that it would be unsafe and unsound to grant this application, by virtue of the greater number of occupants living there.*

The committee also added that as Natural England and Loughton Town Council have both advised in their main modifications responses to the Inspector (autumn 2021) that the LPSV cannot yet be considered justified, effective, or consistent with national policy in relation to detriment to the SAC. Therefore, we object to this application because of the urbanisation effect, burden on recreational pressure, and damage to air quality in the SAC that the application, alone or with other projects, will engender.