



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 October 2020

By Euan FS Pearson BA(Hons) BTP FRGS MRICS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27/11/2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/20/3250814

31 Scotland Road, Buckhurst Hill IG9 5NP

- 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 Ian Haycock against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/2934/19 dated 3 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey rear extension at 31 Scotland Road, Buckhurst Hill IG9 5NP, in accordance with the terms of application Ref EPF/2934/19, dated 3 December 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 plan: Drawing No.02 Revision D.
 - 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.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse on the north side of Scotland Road, that is characterised by a variety of house types and architectural styles. Properties on this side of the street have rear gardens sloping down towards Amberley Road. I note that a number of dwellinghouses have been extended to the rear, including No.37 with its substantial, full height, two-storey addition to the side and rear.

4. The appeal property has an existing rear ground floor extension, approximately 3m deep. It is proposed to add an inter-connected, two-storey extension with mono-pitch roof, around 4.8m wide. Built into the slope, the proposal will sit at the boundary with No.33. Running along the other side of that boundary is a sizeable outbuilding, its roof ridge at a height similar to that of the eaves on the appeal property.
5. The height of the proposed development is well below that of the appeal property and the adjacent outbuilding. This, taken with: its proposed width, approximately half of the rear elevation; and the size/depth of the garden; results in a scale of development that is acceptable and does not dominate the appeal property, even at a depth of around 6m due to the presence of the neighbouring outbuilding.
6. Views of the rear elevation of the appeal property are partially obscured by the proposal but not to a significant degree. The use of white painted brickwork, glazing and grey roofing is similar to that that exists and not inharmonious with the appeal property. Therefore, I consider that the proposal does not cause harm to the character or appearance of the building, nor its locality.
7. Therefore, the proposal complies with policies CP2 and DBE10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998 and Alterations 2006, and emerging policies DM9 of the Epping Forest Local Plan Submission Version 2017. Among other things, these require residential extensions to complement the street scene, townscape and existing buildings. Similarly, creating high quality buildings and places is fundamental to sustainable development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (NPPF).

Conditions

8. I have considered the need for conditions against the advice on conditions set out in the NPPF and the Planning Practise Guidance. I have imposed 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 to match the existing dwellinghouse, to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Euan FS Pearson

INSPECTOR