

Theydon Bois Parish Council

Director of Service, Planning Services
Epping Forest District Council
Civic Offices, High Street
Epping, Essex
CM16 4BZ

The Planning Committee of the Parish Council has raised objection to this application. We would be prepared to send a representative to an Area Planning Sub-Committee of EFDC, if this method of determination is deemed appropriate.

22nd May, 2020

Application No: **EPF/0737/20**
Applicant Name: Mr Gary Putt

Officer: Muhammad Rahman

RETURN: 25th May, 2020

Location: 20 Dukes Avenue, Theydon Bois, CM16 7HE

Proposal: Proposed first floor side extension and part two part single storey rear extension (Revised application to EPF/3075/19).

Return: OBJECTION

The Planning Committee acknowledged revisions made to this application, but raised the following concerns:

Cat-slide roof: 20 Dukes Avenue is one of many original, semi-detached, dwellings in the Baldocks Estate which feature the distinctive and characteristic 'Cat-slide roof', which is mirrored on the adjoining property at No.18. This notable design feature makes a positive contribution to the individual dwellings, affording them their visual articulation and interest, and adds to the character of the streetscene as a whole.

There is a strong planning precedent for the retention of the Cat-slide roof (throughout the estate) which is evidenced by planning decisions relating to 78 Forest Drive (EPF/0389/12) and the appeal decision under APP/J1535/D/12/2176034; 33 Dukes Avenue (EPF/1357/18), which is in the near vicinity; and 9 Orchard Drive (EPF/0569/17), among others. By virtue of this established precedent, the recommended set-back from the front façade for first floor extensions is approximately 50cm. Such a set-back is intended to ensure that clear evidence of both the distinctive slope, and the tile, of the Cat-slide roof are clearly retained in any new development.

However, in consideration of this current application, there is ambiguity in the Proposed Front Elevation Plan (Drawing No. D.A.1B) as to whether the retention of the Cat-slide roof is intended in any form. The Side Elevation Drawing, and the Proposed First Floor Plan (Drawing No. D.A.2A), now show that the front elevation would be rendered but indicate no physical evidence of either the existing set-back of the Cat-slide roof (from the principal elevation) or its retention in the new extension. This element should also be evident on the First Floor Plan, and on a Roof Plan.

As mentioned previously, this should be clearly evident on any approved plans in order to ensure that it is retained. Should the Cat-slide roof be omitted from the proposal, it would unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached pair, to the detriment of the adjoining neighbour and the visual amenity of the streetscene.

The Planning Committee therefore raised objection again, and recommended that the plans be amended to clearly show the Cat-slide roof, its set-back from the front façade, and its distinctive tile.

Impact on No.18: In noting the reduction in depth (from 4 metres to 3 metres) of the single storey element of the proposal, the Planning Committee had regard to the Planning Officer's Report and the reasons given for refusal of application EPF/3075/19 (which focused on the negative impact on the adjoining neighbour at 18 Dukes Avenue):

“The proposed extension by reason of its height, width and depth would result in....a significant loss of light, outlook, privacy, cause a severe sense of enclosure and appear excessively overbearing when viewed from the rear garden area and ground floor rear habitable room glazing of this adjoining dwellinghouse.”

In appraising this revised application, the Committee questioned whether the proposal had been altered sufficiently to overcome the objections of the Planning Officer to the earlier application, and concluded that it had not. In particular, it was felt that, since the reduction in depth related only to the single storey element of the proposal, there had been no revisions made which would mitigate against the negative impact on neighbour amenity caused by the two-storey element of the proposed design.

Whilst the Officer’s Report for the previous application highlighted the negative impact on neighbour amenity at No.18, the Planning Committee was of the view that both No.18 and No.22 would be affected.

From the perspective of the adjoining neighbour at No.18, the Planning Committee felt that the reduction of one metre in the depth of the single-storey extension had achieved little in lessening the impact of the overly-dominant nature of the proposal as a whole. The single-storey extension, by being built on the shared boundary, would likely be intrusive to the outlook from No.18, whilst the raised position of the extension, and the patio area, could also lead to overlooking of the garden.

Impact on No.22: In consideration of the Side Elevation Plan from the perspective of the adjacent neighbour at No.22, the Planning Committee considered that the proposed two-storey side extension would be excessively large. In particular, it would appear that the outlook from the first floor side windows would be significantly impacted by the visually-intrusive and overly-dominant side elevation wall. The Planning Committee would question whether the proposal would fall foul of the 45 degree rule and would suggest that a site visit should be carried out to ascertain whether this is the case (rather than rely on the submitted plans to obtain an estimate). Further, the resultant part two-storey design, which would extend significantly beyond the current rear building line of the neighbouring properties, would be out-of-keeping with the scale of extensions to other similar properties in the vicinity.

Fenestration: The Proposed First Floor Plan shows a bathroom incorporating an external window, aligned with the shared boundary of the adjoining neighbour, which could result in overlooking of the patio area of No.18. The Planning Committee would suggest that the following Condition be applied on any future grant of Planning Permission if this feature is retained:

“The window opening in the side elevation overlooking No.18 Dukes Avenue, shall be entirely fitted with obscured glass with a minimum Level 3 obscurity and have fixed frames to a height of 1.7 metres above the floor of the bathroom in which the window is installed and shall be permanently retained in that condition.”

Reason for Condition: To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to the occupants of the neighbouring property, in accordance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, policy DBE9 of the adopted Local Plan and Alterations and policy DM 9 of the Epping Forest Local Plan (2011-2033).

The submitted plans also reveal that there is, already in existence, a large raised patio area immediately to the rear of the property and the Planning Committee would suggest that a site visit may be required in order to ensure that no unwanted overlooking could result from this structure or the new extension.

For the reasons given above, the Planning Committee, therefore, objects to the application and considers it to be contrary to Policies DBE9 & DBE10 of the Current Local Plan (1998) and Alterations (2006), and Policy DM 9 and DM 10E of the Epping Forest District New Local Plan (2011-2033).