

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 August 2021

by Martin Chandler BSc, MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/W/21/3268153

41 & 43 Oak Lodge Avenue, Chigwell IG7 5JA

- 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 S Sarwar & G. Singh against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/2332/20, dated 9 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as: 'No 43 - Proposed double storey side/rear extension and double storey front extension to match existing front extension at 41 Oak Lodge Avenue. Proposed part single storey rear extension at both properties. Proposed hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormers at both properties involving alterations to the existing roof (similar to the approved scheme @ 47 Oak Lodge).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a pair of semi-detached dwellings with hipped roofs. It is located within a road that exhibits a general consistency in house types with space between buildings. The vast majority of properties have bay windows with hipped roofs, and although many properties have been extended to the side at first floor level, including No 41, the overwhelming majority retain the hipped roof feature. In this respect, the road has a degree of uniformity and architectural rhythm which creates a pleasing street scene. Due to the presence of the hipped roof and the generous gap to the side of No 43, the pair of semi-detached houses that are the subject of this appeal are entirely consistent with the prevailing pattern of development.
4. The proposal would introduce a two storey extension to the side of No 43 which would include a forward projection to match that at No 41. This form of extension is notable within the street, however, the proposal would also alter the roof form of the pair of buildings from the hipped roof, to a pitched roof with gable ends. The proposed roof alterations and side extension to No 43 would substantially increase the bulk and mass of the pair of houses. Moreover, due to the side extension at No 45, the space to the right of the houses when viewed from the street would significantly decrease, with a similarly harmful effect caused by the roof alteration to No 41, and its proximity to the extended

- No 39. Consequently, the overall effect of the proposal would be to create a visually imposing, dominant and bulky structure with little space about it. This would cause demonstrable harm to the pleasing rhythm of the street scene which is generated by its consistent roofscape and the space found between buildings.
5. There are many examples within the street of side extensions and roof alterations, some of which have been more successful than others. However, in my judgement, the prevailing form of development is that of semi-detached houses with hipped roofs and space between buildings. For the reasons identified above, the proposal would be harmful to this dominant pattern of development, and consequently, it would be detrimental to the appearance of the street scene.
 6. The proposal would also include large rear facing dormer windows. Based on the evidence before me, there are examples of similar roof additions within the locality, but these do not detract from the principal characteristics of the street that are identified above. Consequently, although the overall size of the proposed dormer windows rely on the side extension and roof alterations, I find no demonstrable harm with this element of the proposal.
 7. However, as identified above, the other elements of the proposal would be substantially at odds with the broader street scene. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policies CP2, DBE9 and DBE10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Alterations (2006), and Policies DM9 and DM10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017. Taken together, these seek amongst other things, residential extensions which protect the quality of the built environment.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR