

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/17/3170197

43 Smarts Lane, Loughton IG10 4BU

- 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 Craig Fennings against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/2642/16, dated 7 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is remove existing London style roof and build a mansard loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene.

Reasons

3. Smarts Lane is a residential street of predominantly two storey dwellings of individual design or arranged in small groups of similar character and appearance. Nos 43, 41 and 39 are such a group in the form of a short terrace with consistent design features. These include a front parapet, which obscures a butterfly roof, with small chimney pots visible from the street.
 4. The proposal involves a raised mansard style roof extension to the existing roof. Due to the extent of the set-back from the front of the roof and the limited width of the street, it would not be possible to see the extension from immediately in front of the terrace. Approaching the terrace from the south, however, there is a highly open aspect to the side of the three properties and it is possible to see the full extent of the roof with the chimney pots above the terraced dwellings.
 5. From this view, the unaltered and consistent appearance of the roofscape is readily apparent. The open, undeveloped roof contributes to the character and appearance of the group and to the quality of the street scene. The addition of development in the form of a raised roof to one part of the terrace would upset its existing uniformity and consistent appearance. Despite the majority of buildings in this part of Smarts Lane being different, most appear to be
-

unaltered and have retained their original built form. In this setting the roof extension would be a prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and street scene.

6. To the rear, the terrace displays a more complex roof form with less uniformity than the front. The extended roof would be less prominent in this setting and would be visible only in isolated views from surrounding gardens. As such, it would not cause material harm from this perspective. Nonetheless, this does not overcome the harmful effects that would result from the development as seen from the public realm along Smarts Lane.
7. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to the following policies of the Council's Local Plan and Alterations: CP2(iv), concerning the safeguarding and enhancement of the character of the urban environment; CP7 which, amongst other matters, requires new development in urban areas to not result in unsympathetic change; and DBE10, which requires residential extensions to complement the street scene. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section seven concerning good design.
8. For the reasons given I conclude that that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR