
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/21/3272422
70 Beaconfield Road, EPPING, CM16 5AT

- 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 Federico Ciccotti against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref, PL/EPF/2689/20 dated 19 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey, ground-floor front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area around Beaconfield Road.

Reasons

3. No 70 Beaconfield Road is a semi-detached house situated on the northern side of the road. The houses along this part of the road are of generally similar design, being wide-fronted with a small front porch and having a moderate-sized front garden. Nos 70 and 72 are a little different in that they have a shallow front bay with a canopy roof over the bay and front door combined. The proposed extension would be sited within the front garden area of the house, which is currently tarmac-surfaced. It would be some 4.7 metres wide and would project forward around 3 metres from the main front elevation of the house and around 2.4 metres from the front of the bay window. It would have a shallow pitched roof rising from an eaves height of around 2.9 metres at the front, to a maximum height of 3.3 metres.
4. The Council contends that the proposed extension, by reason of its scale and form, does not sufficiently maintain the established pattern of development along Beaconfield Road and that it would cumulatively result in a bulky and dominant extension which is out of context and unsympathetic, harmful to the visual character and appearance of the property and streetscape.
5. Policy CP7 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) indicates that new development which results in unsympathetic change will not be permitted. Policy DBE1 of the LP notes that new developments should respect their setting in terms of, amongst other things, their scale, proportion, siting and massing.

6. The appeal property is at the eastern end of a row of semi-detached houses that stretches along Beaconfield Road from No 70 itself to No 84. There is a uniform building line created by the main front elevations of these dwellings, as there is also with the houses on the opposite side of the road. The proposed extension would project a significant distance forward of this building line, and would appear as a prominent and discordant feature, out of context with the essentially uniform character of the houses along this part of the road. Furthermore, because of its 3 metre depth, the extension would have a very shallow roof pitch which would also appear unsympathetic to the design of the rest of the house.
7. The appellant refers to other examples of forward projections at houses along nearby Rayfield, and addresses on Queens Road which is some distance further away. I note these examples, but with regard to the examples on Rayfield, both appear to be forward projections to houses whose front elevations are set back from the adjacent dwelling, such that the extension does not project beyond a line formed by the front porch or front canopy of the adjacent property. They appear, therefore, less prominent than would be the case with the current proposal. The examples along Queens Road are some distance removed from Beaconfield Road and would not appear to have as deep a forward projection as that proposed at the appeal property.
8. The appellant also contends that the extension would not be readily visible in the street scene because of the high boundary fence at the adjacent No 68 Beaconfield Road, which would block views from the east. I accept this point. However, the upper portion of the extension would be visible from the east, and the whole of the extension would be prominent when viewed from opposite and when approaching from the west, where it would appear out of context with the rest of the rows of houses on each side of the road.
9. Finally, the appellant notes that the additional space resulting from the extension would be helpful in allowing his family to work and study from home. I sympathise with this desire but, from the information before me, I am not convinced that the proposal submitted is the only way to provide such additional space.
10. In conclusion, I have considered this proposal in the context of its surroundings along and around Beaconfield Road, and I find that the proposed extension would appear discordant with both the host property and the surrounding area, such that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area along this part of Beaconfield Road. On this basis, it would conflict with Policies CP7 and DBE1 of the LP and, accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR