



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by J L Cheesley BA(Hons) DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 October 2020.

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/20/3251064

34 Graylands, Theydon Bois, Epping CM16 7LB

- 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 Flamur Cahani against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/2914/19 was refused by notice dated 24 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft extension and front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. I consider the main issues to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow in a group of properties of similar design set back behind a green open space. The symmetry of the frontages and front roof designs creates a strong cohesive group which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the streetscene.
4. The proposal includes a flat roof front dormer. There are no other front dormers in this group of dwellings. From my observations, due to the scale, design and position of this proposed dormer, it would unacceptably unbalance this pair of semi-detached dwellings. It would appear as an incongruous feature which would significantly disrupt the notable degree of symmetry of both this pair of dwellings and the wider group. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding streetscene.
5. For the reasons stated above and having taken into consideration all matters raised, including examples of other developments outside this distinct group, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding streetscene. Thus, the proposal would be contrary to saved Policies CP2 and DBE10 in the Epping

Forest Local Plan (1998) and Alterations (2006), particularly where they seek to ensure that extensions complement and, where appropriate, enhance the existing building. I consider these policies to be broadly in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly where the Framework seeks to ensure good design that is sympathetic to local character.

6. I have been referred to emerging Policies DM9 (D) and DM10 (E) in the Epping Forest Local Plan Submission Version 2017 with regard to high quality design. These policies may be subject to future alteration, but I have attributed some weight to their advanced stage in my determination of this appeal.
7. It must be acknowledged that at the heart of the Framework is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. It sets out the three overarching objectives which are interdependent.
8. Turning to the economic objective, some very small benefit would accrue in relation to the construction of the proposal. In terms of the social objective, the proposal would provide additional living accommodation. However this would not be within a well-designed built environment. I now turn to the environmental objective. For the reasons stated above, I have found that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding streetscene. The harm is so significant in terms of both the social and environmental objectives that taking the three overarching objectives together, the proposal would not constitute sustainable development.

J L Cheesley

INSPECTOR