

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2021

**by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24 September 2021**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/21/3275300**

### **1 Goldings Rise, Loughton IG10 2QP**

- 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 and Mrs Daryl Player against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
  - The application Ref: PL/EPF/0531/21, dated 23 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
  - The development proposed is described as a 'proposed 2 storey side extension and single storey rear extension, with roofline of proposed 2 storey extension at 1.5 storeys to be in keeping with host building and be subservient to host'.
- 

## **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## **Procedural Matters**

2. The applicant is named as Mrs Rene Brand. She has given her written authorisation for the appeal to be lodged in the names of Mr and Mrs Daryl Player.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021, and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. As part of the determination of this appeal, I afforded the main parties an opportunity to comment upon the implications of this change for the purposes of determining this appeal. I have determined this appeal in accordance with the relevant parts of the development plan including the Framework.
4. The local planning authority (LPA) has referred in its decision notice to the Epping Forest Local Plan submission version (2017) (ELP) which has yet to complete its examination in public and is not therefore an adopted policy document. I therefore afford it limited weight.

## **Main Issue**

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the property and the wider area.

## Reasons

6. Goldings Rise and its surroundings are a steeply sloping area of suburban, mainly detached dwellings with front and rear amenity spaces which accommodate off-street parking. The area is generally characterised by a consistency of gaps between the properties, affording glimpses of land and spaces beyond and which help to give the area a spacious character and appearance.
7. The appeal property possesses the above characteristics, though it includes a single storey attached garage to its side boundary and which abuts a similar garage to the neighbouring dwelling. However, as the garages are single storey, views of the woodland canopy beyond can still be seen above them and the spaciousness of the area is not unduly compromised.
8. The proposed development, including the replacement of the single storey garage by a two-storey extension abutting the boundary to the dwelling, would obscure such views and adversely affect the spaciousness of the area. While I have no information before me to suggest that the occupier of the neighbouring property might, at some time, wish to do the same, there would be less reason to prevent this if the current appeal proposal was allowed. The overall effect would be a further reduction to the spaciousness of the area and the creation of an adverse terracing effect.
9. The appellant has referred to other instances in the surrounding area where extensions have been constructed. No. 4 Goldings Rise has been extended, but the extension is set off from the neighbouring boundary. Reference is also made to extensions to 73 Goldings Road. However, there are gaps between it and the adjoining properties, and even if there were none, it would not provide a reason for departing from the generally spacious nature of the development in the area created in part by the gaps between buildings.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with policies CP2 and DBE2 of the ELP which aim to safeguard the setting and character of the urban environment, or with policy DBE3 which requires spaces between buildings to be created and attractive. Furthermore, it would not conform with policy DBE10 which aims to ensure that extensions are separated from neighbouring buildings or with chapter 12 of the Framework which emphasises the need for good design.

## Conclusion

11. The development would not accord with the development plan for the area when considered as a whole, and there are no material planning considerations which would justify granting planning permission that would conflict with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Steven Hartley*

INSPECTOR