

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2016

by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/16/3156235

49 Manor Road, Chigwell IG7 5PL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mohammad Chaudhry against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/1593/16, dated 8 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 4 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 49 Manor Road, Chigwell IG7 5PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref, PL/EPF/1593/16 dated 8 June 2016 subject to the conditions set out below.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 49-PP-200, 49-PP-201A, 49-PP-202A, 49-PP-203A, 49-PP-204A, 49-PP-205A, 49-PP-206A, 49-PP-207A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary matter

2. At the time of my site visit work was under construction on various alterations to 49 Manor Road, however no work had commenced on the first floor extension which is the subject of this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 49, although partially under construction forms a large detached house set in its own spacious grounds. To the rear of the site is a swimming pool building. Manor Road is characterised by similar large detached houses set in
-

generous plots and of varying designs and styles of architecture, with no one form dominating. To the rear of the site is a row of houses on Stradbroke Drive. The tops of the roofs of these properties could just be seen over the swimming pool building from the rear garden of No 49.

5. The proposal is for a first floor extension, about 12.3 metres wide, sited approximately centrally over a ground floor extension, extending the width of No 49. Its height would be about 6 metres, together with the ground floor extension. It would have a mono pitched crown roof. There would be a variety of styles of roof on No 49 including hipped, small gables and dormer roofs. As a result the small amount of crown roof proposed on the extension, within a central location would not dominate the rear elevation but would be subordinate to the other design features. Furthermore, I saw that the house at 53 Manor Road had a similar designed roof on its rear elevation albeit of a smaller depth. Nonetheless, the roof of the rear extension would not look out of place or unique within the surrounding area.
6. For the reasons above I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of either the house or the surrounding area. There would therefore be no conflict with saved Policies CP2 (iv) and DBE 10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998 with alterations 2006 or the National Planning Policy Framework. These require that development should always seek to secure high quality design and safeguards and enhances the setting, character and townscape of the urban environment and the existing building.

Other matters

7. The extension would be about 6.4 metres from the boundary with 47 Manor Road which is marked by a high close boarded fence together with trees and shrubs. No 47 is set on a similar line to No 49. As a result the first floor rear extension would extend a small amount beyond the rear elevation of No 47. Given the distance between the extension and No 47 there would only be opportunity for oblique views from the windows serving the rear elevation of No 47 towards the extension. The occupiers of No 47 would have otherwise open views. I do not consider therefore that the proposal would have an unacceptable overbearing appearance or level of enclosure to No 47.
8. I noted that there were three dormer extensions on the rear elevation rather than the two proposed on plan 49-PP-205. I have also seen comments received regarding whether the various elements of work are being carried out in accordance with the approved plans, or whether the dormer windows fall within permitted development allowances. However, these matters are not for me to comment on within the remit of this appeal regarding the first floor rear extension.

Conditions

9. In the interests of clarity it is appropriate that there is a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. Furthermore, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area the materials used to construct the extension should match those on the host dwelling.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR