



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020 by Elizabeth Davies BSc (Hons) PIEMA

Decision by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/19/3242453

40 Traps Hill, Loughton IG10 1SZ

- 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 Alan Marcelis against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/1805/19, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a large detached two storey dwelling located on the corner of Traps Hill and West View. The properties along Traps Hill are all large detached properties, set back from the road with front gardens and driveways. Whilst the majority of the properties have mature planting along the front boundaries, which largely screens views from the road, the planting along the appeal property boundary is new and immature and does not currently screen views of the appeal property or front drive.
5. The proposed garage would be located to the front of the property on an area of existing hardstanding. Due to the large scale of the proposed garage it would occupy a significant proportion of the hardstanding and, in combination with its height and bulky roof design including two dormer windows, would have a rather cramped appearance on the area at the front of the property, detracting from the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Whilst I note that the materials proposed would seek to match the main house, this would not address the more fundamental issues of the scale of the garage.

6. Also, the property's location on a corner plot means it would be in a prominent position in views from Traps Hill and West View. The forward siting of the proposed garage combined with its bulk and height would result in it appearing dominant in the street scene. I acknowledge that the planting on the boundary of the property is evergreen, would mature and would eventually help to screen views, mitigating to some extent the adverse effect on the character and appearance on the surrounding area. However, due to the height and bulk of the proposed garage, I do not believe this planting would effectively screen views completely.
7. In support of the appeal, the appellant has referred me to No 27 and No 34 Traps Hill and No 64 and No 73 Church Lane as examples of properties that have similar developments. Although I saw on my site visit that all these properties do feature garages, there are a number of differences. The garages at No 34 Traps Hill and No 73 Church Lane are single storey and lower in height compared to the proposal. Whilst the garage at No 27 Traps Hill is similar in design to the proposal, it is set further to the side of the dwelling and further back from the road, and therefore has a less dominant effect on the host dwelling and the street scene than this proposal would. The garage at No 64 Church Lane is attached to the host property and reads as an extension. The examples are therefore not comparable to the proposed garage.
8. On the basis of the above, the proposal would be contrary to Policies CP7 and DBE1 of the Local Plan Alterations (Adopted July 2006). Policy CP7 seeks, amongst other things, to protect existing character and ensure development which results in over-development or unsympathetic change will not be permitted. Policy DBE1 requires that new buildings respect their setting in terms of scale, proportion, siting, massing, height and orientation and are of a size and position so that their significance in the street scene is appropriate. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 which states, amongst other things, that development must contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area and relate positively to context and locality having regard to building heights, form scale and massing prevailing around the site. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to protect character and appearance.

Other Matters

9. It is acknowledged that the appellant has sought to address the Council's concerns with this proposal from comments received on a previously refused scheme and verbal advice, but I must consider the proposal currently before me.
10. The lack of harm to the living conditions of neighbouring properties is noted, but does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that has been found.
11. Whilst the Appellant has suggested a number of planning conditions that they consider may mitigate the impact of the development, I do not agree that these measures would overcome the harm to character and appearance identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR