



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/19/3239508

71 Roundmead Avenue, Loughton IG10 1PZ

- 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 Mark Perring against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/1677/19, dated 5 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is alterations/extension to the existing roof/loft conversion, alterations to existing ground floor rear extension, garage conversion, internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations and extension to the existing roof/loft conversion, alterations to the existing ground floor rear extension, garage conversion and internal alterations at 71 Roundmead Avenue, Loughton, IG10 1PZ in accordance with the terms of application Ref EPF/1677/19, dated 5 July 2019 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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: Drawing Nos. 1439 (Site Plan), 1439/1, 1439/2, 1439/3, 1439/4, 1439/SK/1 and 1439/SK/2.
 - 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.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issues

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling located on the southern side of Roundmead Avenue, within what is an established residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached two-storey properties of varying architectural styles and roof forms. The land rises steeply up from the north-east to the south-west, such that the appeal property lies on higher ground than its neighbour at No.70, and on lower ground than No.72.
5. The current roof appears odd and lop-sided as it comprises a gable end roof with rear flat roofed dormer on its north eastern side, and a lower hipped roof with small flat roofed central section on its south-western side. The proposal would result in alterations to the existing roof to create a half-hipped roof, which would reflect the height of the existing gable end and thus raising the height of the existing hipped roof section. The existing rear facing dormer would be altered to be set in further from the flanks than at present and extended in width across the new roof.
6. Although the Council, and Loughton Parish Council, state that the proposed roof design would be excessively bulky, I find it would improve the appearance of the dwelling and simplify the existing roof form which constitutes a detracting feature in the street scene. Although it would add bulk and, on the south-west side, height, the proposal would bring balance to the structure of the roof and would unify the general appearance of the house. It would not be incongruous, would complement the neighbouring houses, and would therefore not constitute poor design. Furthermore, by setting-in the rear dormer from the flanks of the dwelling, the proposal would arguably reduce the prominence of the existing rear dormer within the street scene.
7. The proposed window openings and Juliet balconies would not appear dominant in the context of the size of the dwelling and, being sited to the rear of the property, they would not be visible within the public realm. I am satisfied they would not harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. The rear ground floor extension would also be altered primarily by removing the central glazed roof element and creating a unified single-storey flat roof extension with large glazed sliding doors. The Council raise no objection to these alterations, and I consider that they would bring architectural cohesion to this elevation and simplify the appearance of the property. The conversion of the garage would also have no harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. I therefore find the proposed alterations and extensions would adequately tie-in with the existing dwelling and would not result in visually discordant features that would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. Given the above, the proposed development is in accordance with Policies CP2 and DBE10 of the Epping Forest District Adopted Local Plan and Alterations, and emerging Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epping Forest Local Plan Submission Version 2017 which together seek to ensure proposals and residential extensions contribute positively to the existing dwelling, the street scene and their context. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which aims to ensure proposals are sympathetic to local character.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested a number of conditions that it would wish to see imposed in the event that the appeal was successful. I have considered the suggested conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.
12. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have also included a condition requiring the external materials match the existing building, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR