



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/23/3327428

34 Morgan Crescent, Theydon Bois CM16 7DX

- 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 Paul Elliott against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/0586/23, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2023.
 - The proposed development is to remove existing ground floor conservatory and detached garage. Re-build what was the conservatory area into a larger kitchen/diner area & connect to & re-build garage with a small utility room at rear; new front door / entrance with lobby roof light; wrap-around 2 metre wide pitched roof canopy (to meet a new first floor room) with 4 roof lights to kitchen and 2 roof lights to garage. New room on first floor with roof light to proposed shower; 100mm insulation to existing rear wall to first floor; 1 m wide side entrance to garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential area along a road predominantly characterised by semi-detached properties of distinctive design with gable front elevations, containing projecting bay windows with small pitched roofs over and main roof consisting of a 'double angled' pitched roof the lower part of which consists of a catslide roof extending to single storey eaves level. A number of properties within the street have been extended the majority incorporating first floor side additions set into the catslide roof or extending out from it. There are also a few bungalows such as that on the adjoining site.
4. The appeal site lies on a bend in the road and widens out to the rear forming a triangular shaped plot. A single detached garage is located to the side of the dwelling and the dwelling has a rear conservatory and two dormer windows sited within the catslide roof.
5. The proposal, which involves the removal of the existing garage and conservatory, seeks to make use of the area to the side of the dwelling rather than extending out to any significant degree to the rear. This has resulted in a form of extension that reflects the shape of the plot, rather than the form and

shape of the dwelling itself. The ground floor element is of an angled shape to fit the space and 'wraps around' the proposed first floor side element with a series of 'lean to' roof shapes and a small area of flat roof adjacent to the first-floor side elevation. This results in an awkward shaped addition that does not relate sympathetically to the form and appearance of the host dwelling.

6. The first-floor element comprises a relatively wide addition but of an overall design that, of itself, would be complementary to the host dwelling. However, it would have an awkward relationship with the angled ground floor element, in particular to the side where an odd area of flat roof would be incorporated, seemingly to seek to 'join up' the two. However, this would be an unsuccessful solution that would not achieve good design.
7. Overall, therefore I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene. It would thereby conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan (2023) which seeks development of high quality design that contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area and respects and complements the form and detailing of the original building. The Council has also cited Policy DM10 but as this refers to space standards and other similar design criteria, I find no conflict in these respects.
8. I am aware that the Appellant has made a number of previous applications, including a recent appeal¹, for similar developments. In that recent appeal, the Inspector noted that the different alignments of the ground and first floor elements of the proposed scheme and concluded that this would produce a "*visually incongruous and jarring juxtaposition in the two elements.*" It seems to me that this would remain the case with the current scheme notwithstanding the changes that have been made to attempt to overcome these concerns.
9. I also acknowledge the Appellant's wish to make good use of the 'dead space' to the side of the plot and that part of the single storey element would not be readily visible in the street scene. However, ultimately for the reasons given above, the overall design would not complement the host dwelling nor, as a result, the wider area.
10. I have also taken into account the National Planning Policy Framework and find that the proposal would fail to accord with its policies that seek well designed development that is sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Conclusions

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

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/J1535/D/22/3305962