



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11/02/2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/20/3258571

11 Parklands, Chigwell, IG7 6LW.

- 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 Alex Aviram against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/0784/20, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is a three storey rear extension and a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site, comprising of a detached two storey property of a traditional appearance with brick elevations and steeply pitched deep tiled hipped roof, is located in a residential street of detached properties of varying size and design. The dwelling on the appeal site has a main two storey element of symmetrical design with central entrance feature under a gable end and chimneys either side with attached subservient two storey wing to the northern side and single-storey wing to the south.
4. There are a number of applications relating to the property including a recent permission for a three-storey rear extension and first floor side extension¹. The proposed side extension is of the same size and design as that granted permission under this previous decision and thus has already been found acceptable by the Council.
5. The main difference would therefore be in respect of the rear extension. As approved, this consists of a large ground floor addition extending to a depth of around 4 metres from the original rear elevation, slightly greater in the central section. Above this, the first and second floors extend to less than half the depth of the ground floor. This would involve the introduction of a small central 'crown' roof. The current appeal scheme proposes to extend the first and second floors over the full extent of the approved ground floor, and as a

¹ EPF/0182/19

result, it would be considerably larger, and would incorporate a larger central flat 'crown' roof.

6. I consider that the resulting increased bulk, particularly that related to the roof element which would have the same depth and ridge height as the host dwelling and include an additional gable end, would appear out of scale and proportion with the original dwelling. Whilst the approved scheme noted above would also increase the roof bulk, the extent of this is reasonably modest compared to the host dwelling. Conversely, the proposed extensions and additions would add considerable further bulk to what is a well-proportioned dwelling of traditional character and appearance. I consider that this would be unsympathetic to the scale and proportions of the host dwelling thus detracting from its character and appearance.
7. Although the extension would be to the rear of the property, I saw at my site visit that the rear of the dwelling is visible due to its forward position relative to the adjoining dwelling, which is at a lower level, and due to its location on a bend in the road. Contrary to the view of the appellant, I consider that the proposal would be seen in this view beyond the side extension. The excessive size of the proposed extension would be visible and noticeable, seen in this view against the modest depth of the original dwelling. This view is part of the overall consideration of character and appearance and I note that it was referred to by third parties.
8. The appellant has referred to a number of other 'significantly larger' properties in the vicinity of the site and I noted the one opposite the appeal site at the time of my visit. Whilst such developments may influence the character of the area, they do not in my view necessarily provide 'examples' of what might be appropriate on the appeal site itself, albeit I would agree with the appellant that in this context the appeal proposal would not necessarily result in an overdevelopment of the appeal site itself.
9. Overall, however, for the reasons given above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy DBE10 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan (1998) which seeks to protect the quality of the built environment and to ensure that residential extensions complement and where appropriate enhance the appearance of the street scene and the existing building. For these reasons it would also fail to satisfy policy DM9 of the submission version of the emerging local plan.
10. I consider that the above policy is generally consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 127 which seeks to ensure that development adds to the overall quality of the area, is visually attractive and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

11. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR