



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 December 2020

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/20/3259157

55 Spring Grove, Loughton, IG10 4QD

- 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 Thomas Carter against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/0963/20, dated 6 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to rear at ground floor level. Removal of roof to left-hand (when viewed from road) chalet bungalow element. Walls raised to form new first floor. New roof to match comprising 2 bedrooms, 1 bathroom at second floor level with 2 No dormers to front and 3 No dormers to rear. Internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council, in its decision notice, refers to the policies of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 (LPSV). The LPSV has not been adopted but is at an advanced stage, such that its policies may carry material weight in planning decisions.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached part chalet bungalow, part two storey dwelling. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached dwellings, including chalet bungalows, two storey dwellings and two storey dwellings with rooms at roof level.
 5. Dwellings in the area tend to be set back from the street behind garden and/or parking areas and have longer gardens to the rear. The set back from the road, the presence of gardens and the presence of gaps between buildings all combine to provide for a relatively green and spacious local character.
-

6. During my site visit, I observed that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, such changes generally respect the host property and appear in keeping with the surrounding area.
7. The proposed development would significantly increase the height and depth of the appeal property, adding substantial volume.
8. A gable roof is proposed. This would appear in contrast to the hipped roof form characteristic of many neighbouring properties and would also, as a result of its gable design and two large dormers, appear as a particularly large and bulky addition. As such, the proposed roof would result in a development that would appear top-heavy.
9. The harmful impact of the above would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed development drawing attention to itself as an incongruous and unduly dominant feature.
10. Further, the scale of the proposal would result in a development that would fail to appear subordinate to, but would rather, overwhelm the appearance of the host property. In addition, the height and overall bulk of the proposal would result in it appearing to "loom above" the neighbouring property at 57 Spring Road and I find that this would have an unbalancing effect on the street scene.
11. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to saved Local Plan and Alterations¹ Policies CP2, DBE9 and DBE10 Plan Policy DM1; and to LPSV Policies DM9 and DM10, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Epping Forest District Local Plan Alterations (1998 and 2006).