



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 July 2019

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/19/3229946
102 Forest Edge Buckhurst Hill IG9 5AB.

- 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 Gabriel Amodio against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/0256/19, dated 23 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor and gable roof extension with full width box dormer assembly to rear roof pitch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached property within a row of similar residential properties. Forest Edge is a main road which runs along the eastern edge of Lord Bushes Forest.
4. A number of the dwellings within the immediate row of properties within which the appeal site is located have been the subject of various extensions and additions, including side and rear extensions with flat roofed rear dormers. However, in the main, gaps of varying widths to the side of the semi-detached pairs, have been maintained and are a feature of the street scene.
5. The front part of the proposed first floor extension would be set in from the boundary with the adjoining property to the south, No. 104, but the rear element would extend right up to this side boundary. Given that a full gable roof is proposed over these elements, this would result in there being no gap to the side boundary, the proposed rear part of the extensions effectively 'filling' the whole gap to the boundary at first floor and roof level.
6. This neighbouring property has already been extended to the side at the first floor level, including an element that extends right up to this boundary, with a flank parapet wall on the boundary. Whilst these extensions incorporate a hipped roof, such that the roof slopes away from the boundary, the effect of the proposed extensions at the appeal property would be to completely fill the

remaining gap between the two properties. This would be discernible in the street scene despite the set back of the part of the first floor addition that extends right up to the boundary.

7. The resulting increase in the built form would be out of keeping with the established nature of the built form within the row whereby gaps are an established feature at first floor level between the semi-detached pairs of dwellings as noted above. The loss of the existing gap between the property on the appeal site and adjoining property at No. 104 would therefore result in a terracing effect, at odds with the established pattern of built form.
8. The proposed rear dormer would extend across the whole width of the extended roof, thus filling the whole width of the appeal site. In addition, it would be set down only very slightly from the ridge with no gap to the rear eaves line. As such it would introduce an overly large and bulky rear addition, with very little, if any, of the original or extended rear roofslope being discernible.
9. Overall, I consider that the proposal would be an incongruous form of development, harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. It would thus fail to accord with Policies CP2 and DBE10 (i) and (ii) (a) and (b) of the Epping Forest Local Plan and Alterations (2006) which seek to protect the quality of the built environment by safeguarding and enhancing the setting, character and townscape of the urban environment, and complement the street scene and the existing building by close attention to scale, form and separation from any neighbouring buildings.
10. The Council also refer to Policies DM9(D) and DM10(E) of the Submission Version Local Plan (2017); however, whilst it is a material consideration, only limited weight can be given to it as it is yet to be examined.
11. For the reasons given above it would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework in particular paragraphs 117, 124 and 127 which, amongst other things, promote an effective use of land while safeguarding and improving the environment, and development that creates high quality places and buildings, sympathetic to local character.
12. I note that other properties nearby have been extended, and these include hip to gable roofs as well as flat roofed rear dormers. However, none are of comparable size and a gap is maintained as described above.
13. Whilst the proposed extensions would provide enhanced accommodation for the appellant's family, this factor does not lead me to alter my conclusions set out above.

Conclusions

14. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR