

## ***Report to District Development Management Committee***

***Date of meeting: 28 November 2018***



**Address:** 37 Hanson Drive, Loughton

**Subject:** EPF/1325/18 – proposed two storey side extension replacing the existing attached garage at the side, and a single storey rear extension

**Officer contact for further information:** D. Baker (01992 564514)

**Democratic Services Officer:** S. Tautz (01992 564180)

---

### **Recommendation(s):**

**That planning application EPF/1325/18 be granted planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

- (1) The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this notice;**
- (2) Materials to be used for the external finishes of the proposed development shall match those of the existing building, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority;**
- (3) All construction/demolition works and ancillary operations, including vehicle movement on site which are audible at the boundary of noise sensitive premises, shall only take place between the hours of 07.30 to 18.30 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 hours on Saturday, and at no time during Sundays and Public/Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

### **Report:**

This report was submitted to the 22 August 2018 meeting of Area Plans Sub-Committee South with a recommendation for approval. However, members vote on the application was tied and the Sub-Committee resolved to refer the application to the District Development Management Committee without any recommendation. The officers report to the meeting of the Sub-Committee is reproduced below and carries forward the officer recommendation to grant planning permission subject to the three conditions set out above.

### **Report that went to Area Plans Sub-Committee South on 22 August 2018**

#### **Description of Site:**

The application site is an end of terrace two storey house located in a locality of similar properties. The next terrace starting at No. 39 lies at an angle to no.37 following the line of a bend in the road. The site is located within the built up area of Loughton but the property is not listed nor does it lie within a conservation area.

### **Description of Proposal:**

The proposal is for a two-storey side extension replacing the existing attached garage at the side, and a single storey rear extension. The ground floor accommodation would provide a study and utility room to the side and a dining room to the rear. The first-floor accommodation would include a bedroom with an en suite.

### **Relevant History:**

EPF/0411/80 Front extension and porch -approved

EPF/0305/11-Two storey side extension and part single storey side/front extension, single storey rear extension and rear dormer -approved

EPF/2127/11- Amended approval of EPF/0305/11 raising roof-approved

### **Policies Applied:**

Epping Forest Local Plan and Alterations (1998/2006)

DBE9 - Loss of amenity

DBE -10 Residential extensions

The above policies form part of the Councils 1998 Local Plan. Following the publication of the NPPF, policies from this plan (which was adopted pre-2004) are to be afforded due weight where they are consistent with the Framework. The above policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF and therefore are afforded full weight.

### ***NPPF:***

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has been adopted as national policy since March 2012. Paragraph 215 states that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework. The above policies are broadly consistent with the NPPF and should therefore be given appropriate weight.

### ***Epping Forest District Local Plan (Submission Version) 2017:***

On 14 December 2017, full Council resolved that the Epping Forest Local Plan Submission Version 2017 be endorsed as a material consideration to be used in the determination of planning applications and be given appropriate weight in accordance with paragraph 216 of the NPPF.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF provides that decision-takers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:

- The stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);
- The extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and
- The degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given).

In general terms it is considered that the Submission Version of the Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation and the policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF. As

regards unresolved objections, some policies within the Submission Version have more unresolved objections than others. All of these factors have been taken into consideration in arriving at the weight accorded to each of the relevant policies in the context of the proposed development listed below:

DM9	High Quality Design
DM10	Housing Design and Quality

### **Summary of Representations Received:**

LOUGHTON TOWN COUNCIL: Object to the proposal on the grounds it is overbearing on the neighbours, proposal is too large for the site and it will create a terracing impact.

4 Neighbours were consulted and one reply has been received:

35 HANSON DRIVE- Object - concerned that the proposed rear extension will block light into their dining/kitchen area.

### **Issues and Considerations:**

The main issues of consideration in this instance are the impact on the character of the area and the neighbouring residents. It should also be borne in mind that the lapsed planning approval EPF/2127/11 gave approval to a very similar scheme to that now proposed.

The accompanying text to Policy DBE10 of the adopted Local Plan (carried forward from the 1998 Plan) states that, for end of terrace houses, *two storey extensions may be permitted to extend to the to the plot boundary particularly if any visual gap in the street scene is maintained*. For this reason, the previous EPF/2127/11 was approved - and in any event because the neighbouring end of terrace house at no.39 had not been extended at the side a visual gap would have still been maintained. The current situation is unchanged from that pertaining in 2011 - and consequently the current proposal complies with the adopted Local Plan. Loughton Town Council have objected to this proposal for reasons including the creation of a terracing effect – however in the adopted Local Plan this terracing effect/loss of a visual gap applies to first floor side extensions to semi-detached houses – and not to end of terrace houses as explained above.

The wording of Policy DM9 in the 2017 SLVP is more generalised and less proscriptive than that in the current Adopted Local Plan with regard to this type householder extension. Given that the SVLP has not yet been adopted, that the current scheme complies with the existing adopted Local Plan, and that it is virtually the same as that approved in 2011, it would be unreasonable to refuse the proposed side extension on policy grounds. In design terms the current two storey side extension, which has a 0.5m recess at the front at first floor level, and a lower ridge height than the host dwelling, will have a more subordinate and better design compared to the scheme approved in 2011, and as the dwelling ‘turns the corner’ on the bend the proposed side extension will be less visible from long vantage points.

The proposed two storey side extension will have a limited impact on the amenity and outlook of the ‘detached’ end of terrace house at no.39.

At the rear a 3.1m depth rear extension is proposed with a lean to roof, and will have a height of 2.7m rising to 3.5m where it adjoins the main rear wall of the house. A 3.1m depth is very modest in today’s terms and while it will have some impact on the light and outlook of the objector’s house at no.35 this impact would not be significant. In addition, the extension will lie to east, north east of the rear of no.35, and hence only sunlight in the early morning hours would be affected in any way by the proposed rear extension. Finally, a similar sized

rear extension was previously approved in 2011, and the site circumstances remain much the same as they were in 2011.

**Conclusions:**

For the reasons set out in the report above it is recommended that conditional planning permission be granted.