

To: Kie Farrell, Development Management  
From: Melinda Barham, Trees and Landscape  
Date: 7<sup>th</sup> September 2021  
Your ref:  
Our ref: PL/MB/EPF/1972/21



**Address – 4 Ely Place, Chigwell**

**Proposal – Proposed first floor side extension, repositioning of front entrance door, downlighting to front elevation and first floor landing window. (Revised application to EPF/1386/21)**

We OBJECT to this application on the grounds that it is contrary to -

Policy LL10 – Adequacy for the provision of landscape retention

Policy DM5 Submission version of EFDC Local Plan (Dec 2017) – ‘*Development proposals must be accompanied by sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the retention and protection of trees (including veteran trees)...*’

**Justification**

There are two oaks that are implicated in this proposal – one on the applicants property, the second is in a neighbouring property. Both are protected by Tree Preservation Orders.

Oak tree in neighbours garden – Assuming that the foundations for the existing single storey extension are capable of taking the weight of an additional storey, then there are unlikely to be any direct impacts on the tree during the development process.

However, the concern here is the ‘future liveability’ with a tree so close to the building. The current single storey is part of a kitchen / living room, with opening doors to the rear and roof lights – there are no windows on the site elevation. Earlier this year (under application EPF/2830/20) the owner of this property obtained permission to work on his neighbour oak tree (a reduction of branches by up to 2m) – the reason given on the application form for the work was to ‘*reduce excessive shading*’. This current proposal would result in the loss of the roof lights, so less natural lighting will be possible for this room. We therefore consider it is reasonable to assume that the property owner will have ongoing issues regarding light into this room due to the presence of the tree.

Section 5.3 of BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations, guides us to consider future liveability issues at application stage. In particular where large trees at close proximity to dwellings may lead to apprehension by current / future residents that the trees may fall and hit their house / that they are over bearing on their house / or that they are causing excessive shading. The fact that the property owner already has issues with shading, means that this will be an ongoing problem. As this is foreseeable it does need consideration at planning application stage and not left to the Council being presented with a fait accompli at a later stage via an application for works to TPO trees.

*m e m o*

We therefore object to the first floor extension as we do not consider that the above issues have satisfactorily been taken into account during the design process.

Oak tree in the front garden – It is noted from the proposed ground floor drawing that a porch has been added – the installation of this has not been discussed or shown on the submitted Arb report. As such it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal could be implemented without a detrimental impact on this tree.

Additionally, the rooting system will be impacted on by the loss of soft landscaping. Whilst this may only be considered a small area to lose, we have to take into account the fact that the vast majority of this trees rooting area has already been lost to hard surfacing.



To conclude, we consider that it has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposal could be implemented without a detrimental impact on retained trees ; and that if developed as proposed it is foreseeable that there will be future pressure for tree removals or to have to allow excessive work to trees contrary to our tree work policies.

**Melinda Barham BSc(Hons), Dip Arb L6 (ABC), FGS  
Tree and Landscape Officer**

*m e m o*

*m e m o*