



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 April 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/23/3334271

87 Grosvenor Drive, Loughton, IG10 2LA

- 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 Dan Martin against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/1667/23, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a proposed first-floor rear extension and loft conversion with two small rear dormers and roof light windows.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The appellant has pointed out that the roofline shown on the rear elevation on the plan originally submitted was incorrect. An amended plan, DB/DM/100-Amendment A has been submitted as part of this appeal. The amended plan does not affect the main issue or the planning considerations and, therefore, I have based my decision on the revised version.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of both the existing dwelling and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey dwelling situated in a residential area. A single-storey extension has been added at the rear. Houses in the wider area vary in terms of their design and age, but the appeal property is part of a row of dwellings that have a distinctive appearance, because of their hipped roofs and a narrow set-back gabled section. In my opinion, these properties contribute positively to the streetscene.
5. The proposal, which follows an earlier refusal for a similar development (reference EPF/2487/22), is to construct a first-floor rear extension plus a loft conversion. The scale of the proposal has been reduced compared to the previous scheme. The works would also include two relatively small dormers at the rear and side with roof lights on the street-facing roof slope. Part of the existing roof on the main part of the dwelling would also be changed to a gable.

6. The Council considers that the proposal would be an incongruous addition and that it would conflict with Policies DM9 and DM10 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011 – 2033 (LP). I note that Policy DM10 relates to new housing development and, therefore, I am not persuaded that it is directly relevant to this appeal. However, Policy DM9 is relevant and seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of high quality that relates positively to local characteristics. The policy accords with paragraph 135 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which contains similar provisions.
7. The appellant points to the appeal proposal being smaller than the previous proposal that was refused by the Council, the modest size of the dormers and the fact that the proposed rear extension would not be highly visible from the street. Whilst I largely accept these arguments, the altered roofscape, would, in my opinion, appear incongruous and at odds with one of the distinctive characteristics of both the existing dwelling and this section of the streetscene. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM9 of the LP.
8. In reaching my decision, I have considered other examples of extensions and alterations that have been carried out on properties along Grosvenor Drive, including those brought to my attention by the appellant. These include alterations that have changed hipped roofs to gables. I am also aware that such changes can, in some circumstances, be permitted development. I viewed the other sites during my visit, but in my opinion, they do not make a positive contribution to the area. Therefore, I am not persuaded that they should act as a precedent for this appeal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR