



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/19/3242373

47 Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell IG7 5JA

- 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 Pritesh Patel against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/1865/19 dated 27 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is a dormer extension to rear and new gable roof in order to convert existing loft space (65 sq m) into habitable living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dormer extension to rear and new gable roof in order to convert existing loft space (65 sq m) into habitable living space at 47 Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell IG7 5JA in accordance with the application, Ref EPF/1865/19, dated 27 July 2019 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 001, 002, 003, 004 (Proposed Plans), 004 (Existing & Proposed Elevations), 005 and 006.

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 the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling on a residential road. Whilst the appeal property currently has a very similar appearance to the

attached neighbouring property, there are a large number of examples of semi-detached dwellings along Oak Lodge Avenue which feature variations in style and design and a variety of roof styles are present. Generally, the dwellings are not symmetrical or uniform in their pairs. The variety in appearance contributes to the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposed hip to gable roof alteration would alter the shape and style of the roof and some degree of visual imbalance with the attached neighbouring property would occur. However, it would not exceed the existing ridge height and would be modest in scale, and so it would not appear bulky when viewed from Oak Lodge Avenue. Also the use of matching materials would help to assimilate it with the existing roof. Overall, I consider that it would not be so disruptive to the appearance and character of the pair of dwellings as to be unacceptable. Nor, given the variety of roof designs that exist along Oak Lodge Avenue, would it be detrimental to or appear visually intrusive in the street scene.
6. The proposed rear dormer extension would be flat roofed and set in from the sides of the dwelling. Whilst the proposed dormer would be substantial and would add additional bulk and mass to the dwelling, it would not overly dominate the rear of the dwelling and would not be visible from the public highway.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would accord with Policies CP2 and DBE10 of the Local Plan Alterations (Adopted July 2006). Policy CP2 seeks, amongst other things to safeguard the setting, character and townscape of the urban environment. Policy DBE10 requires that, amongst other things, residential extensions complement the appearance of the street scene and existing building. The development also accords with Policy DM 9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 which seeks to ensure that development proposals relate positively to their context and locality, having regard to the form, scale and mass prevailing around the site.

Other Matters

8. I have taken into account concerns from Chigwell Parish Council in relation to the effect of the proposed development on the outlook and privacy of the occupiers of No 45 and No 49 Oak Lodge Avenue (No 45 and No 49). With regard to the potential for overlooking, the proposal would not introduce any new windows on the side of the dwelling. The windows on the rear dormer would face the rear gardens, but in a built-up residential area such as this, mutual overlooking of back gardens is common and already occurs here. I am therefore satisfied that overlooking of No 45 and No 49 would not be a significant issue. I do not consider the proposal would have an effect on the outlook of the occupiers of No 45 as the proposal would not be visible from within their dwelling and, given the changes are at roof level, it would not significantly affect the outlook from their garden. With regard to No 49, this dwelling features windows on the flank elevation of the property at first floor level which face the appeal property. However, the proposal would not result in the appeal property projecting any closer to No 49 and the changes to the roof style would not harmfully change the outlook from this property either.

Conditions

9. I have imposed the standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and specifying the relevant plans in order to provide certainty. I have included a condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building to protect the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Elizabeth Davies

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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