
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2023

by H Lock BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/22/3306556

1 Rous Road, BUCKHURST HILL, Essex, IG9 6BL

- 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 Tony Cox against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref. EPF/1295/22, dated 31 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion at 1 Rous Road, BUCKHURST HILL, Essex, IG9 6BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. EPF/1295/22, dated 31 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location/Block Plans 1-RR-01; Proposed Arrangement 1-RR-04; and Proposed Elevations 1-RR-05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached house that is in a reasonably prominent position near a road junction, and next to an open driveway and gardens of dwellings fronting Roding Lane. The area is characterised by mostly two-storey houses, with the prevailing roof form being hipped. However, within the wider streetscene and surrounding area there are gabled roofs, including examples where one half of a semi-detached pair has a gable side and the other remains hipped. The appellant has drawn attention to nearby examples of this, including some in equally or more prominent positions. At the appeal

site visit it was apparent that loft conversions with gable sides are now part of the local streetscene.

4. Although the appeal property and the attached building both have hipped roofs, they differ in design as result of extensions. This includes a slightly awkward roof design to the existing side extension to the appeal property, with linked hipped roofs of varying height. This extension and its roof are visible in the streetscene in views across the neighbouring driveway.
5. In this context, the proposal would simplify the existing roof form, with the staggered ridge height and setback position of the lower gable ensuring a degree of subservience to the main dwelling. The rear dormer window would be large and would add to the scale of the development, but its impact on the streetscene of Rous Road would be limited as a result of its position. Views of the proposal from Roding Lane would be distant, and although the property is elevated above its rear garden, the trees in the parkland beyond would filter views from that direction. Considered cumulatively, the additions would not appear excessive in scale and bulk relative to the host building, nor unduly dominant on the streetscene.
6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in its impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and surrounding area, and would comply with Policy DBE10 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998 and Alterations 2006, which requires residential extensions to complement and, where appropriate, enhance the appearance of the streetscene and existing building in matters including scale, form, detail, elevations, materials, roof treatment, and separation from any neighbouring buildings. Given its stage in the examination process I have also had regard to Policy DM 9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan Submission Version 2017 and find no conflict with its design standards.

Other Matters

7. A representation was submitted raising concern about potential encroachment of the neighbouring driveway during the construction of the extension. However, this would be a civil matter between the parties and is beyond the scope of this appeal.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit, I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings as this provides certainty. It is also appropriate to control materials to match the existing dwelling, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the development and the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

H Lock

INSPECTOR