The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/19/3239167
38 Woolhampton Way, Chigwell IG7 4QH

- 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 Mrs Amardeep Sehmi against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
- The application Ref PL/EPF/1574/19, dated 20 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2019.
- The development proposed is a single and part double storey rear extension with part demolition of the existing garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single and part double rear extension with part demolition of the existing garage at 38 Woolhampton Way, Chigwell IG7 4QH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/EPF/1574/19, dated 20 June 2019, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2035/10, 2035/11 and 2035/12.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a two-storey link-detached dwelling within a residential area, located adjacent to Hainault Forest Country Park. The dwelling forms part of a group of four houses on Woolhampton Way (No. 32, 34, 36 and

38) which are similar in appearance and are linked by a garage and car port. The proposal would remove the existing car port and replace the existing garage roof with a pitched roof with a small overhang to the front. It also includes a part two-storey, part single-storey extension to the rear of the dwelling.

5. Although the four dwellings are similar in appearance, their appearance from the road is not identical, with No.32 having extended over the garage. The proposed change to the garage roof of the appeal property would have limited visibility from the road as it would be set back from the front elevation of the house. The rear extension would also not be visible from the public realm to any significant degree. Therefore, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the symmetry or detract from the character of the adjoining properties.

6. The part two-storey and part single-storey rear extension would match the appearance of the existing dwelling and would be consistent with the style of properties within the surrounding area. It was noted during the site visit that No.40 Woolhampton Way has a similar two-storey rear extension and therefore the proposal would not be out of keeping with the surrounding area. The proposed changes to the garage roof would not be excessive or overbearing in nature and would adjoin the proposed extension in a logical and well-designed manner.

7. For the reasons above I consider that the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and therefore would not be in conflict with Policies CP2 and DBE10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan (1998). These Policies seek to maintain the quality of the built environment with development which complements the appearance of the streetscene. It would also be consistent with the general design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework. The proposal would also not conflict with emerging Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version (2017) which seek to ensure new development has a high-quality design which respects the form and setting of original buildings.

Other Matters

8. Objections were raised by third party representations, during the original application, regarding the impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, particularly relating to loss of privacy and loss of light to the side window of No.36 Woolhampton Way. The proposal would not result in any overlooking which is significantly different to the view from the current rear facing windows of the appeal property. The proposed development would also be a sufficient distance from the side window of the neighbouring property to ensure that there would be minimal impact to the light it receives.

9. There are a number of previous extensions to properties along Woolhampton Way and therefore the proposal would not create a precedent for similar development within the area. Furthermore, each planning application would be considered on its own merits.

10. Concerns have been expressed regarding an increased fire risk from the proposed development, as access to the rear of the properties would be blocked. However, the garage is to remain single storey and it has not been

further demonstrated as to why the proposal would increase the fire risk. Therefore, this would not be a reason to withhold planning permission.

11. It is also noted that there are concerns from the occupiers of neighbouring properties regarding party wall issues, the loss of property value, restricted access for maintenance and the effect on buildings insurance due to the development. However, these are civil matters to which I cannot attach any significant weight, and these would not outweigh my finding on the main issue.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. A condition requiring the use of materials matching that of the existing building is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

13. In the Committee Report the Council have also suggested a condition to remove permitted development rights for windows on the side elevations of the development and a condition requiring wheel washing for vehicles leaving the site during construction works. Due to the restrictions in place in respect of new upper floor windows on side elevations a condition to prohibit the addition of side windows would not be necessary. Because of the type and size of the development proposed wheel washing during the construction period would also not be necessary.

Conclusions and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR