



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13.06.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3338090

53 Algers Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4NF

- 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 J Taylor against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/2139/23, dated 25 September 2023, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2023.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing single-storey rear and side extensions, replace with single-storey side and rear and double-storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Since the appeal was lodged, planning permission was granted on 9 May 2024 under Ref EPF/0557/24 for works described as '*The demolition of existing single storey rear and side extensions, replace with single storey side and rear and double storey rear extensions*'. This is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal to which I attach a significant amount of weight.
3. I have been provided with a set of the recently approved plans. The floor plans, ground floor elevations and overall size and scale of the approved works are identical, for all intents and purposes, to the appeal proposal. The only significant difference between both proposals is the design and appearance of the first-floor to the double-storey rear extension and the configuration of the roof over.
4. In light of the extant planning permission, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the double-storey rear extension upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling occupying a corner plot with a return side boundary to Lower Park Road. The dwelling has a two-storey projection with a hipped roof across part of its rear elevation nearest to the plot's side return boundary with a single-storey lean-to across the remaining rear elevation. This arrangement is mirrored by the attached property at No 51. The extant planning permission includes an extension of the two-storey projection rearwards in a contemporary form with an angled façade and hipped roof that would over-sail the chamfered corners of the

extension. Roof tiles would match the existing building, as would the painted, rendered façade at first-floor level. The appeal proposal is for a similar angled façade but in a gabled form, with parapet walls extending above the eaves of the dwelling rising to an apex. Roof tiles behind the parapet would match the existing, as would a painted, rendered finish to the side elevation of the extension. The angled rear elevation of the extension would be finished in brickwork to match the materials used for the ground floor of the original building.

6. Given the property's corner location, the rear elevation of the dwelling is open to clear view from Lower Park Road, particularly at first-floor and roof level. Although the view is oblique, the consistent roof form between Nos 53 and 51, and that which is repeated on the similarly detailed detached dwelling at No 49, is openly perceived and appreciated, providing a sense of balance and rhythm to the area's roofscapes. I appreciate that the extant permission would considerably remodel the appeal property to the rear in a contemporary manner. However, in my view, the use of matching materials at first-floor and the retention of a traditional hipped roof strikes an appropriate balance; blending old with new in a manner that would respect the appearance and roofscape of these neighbouring dwellings.
7. In contrast, the proposed gable and parapet walls would stand out as an obvious departure from the traditional roof form of the existing dwelling. Any degree of imbalance between the semi-detached pair created by the permitted alterations at first-floor would be significantly exaggerated by the use of brickwork at this level and a roof form that would bear little correlation with the existing. In my assessment the change would be incongruous and detrimental to the appearance of the dwelling. This in turn would be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area. As such, there would be conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One, adopted March 2023, as far as it requires development proposals, including extensions and alterations to residential buildings, to relate positively to the original building and their surroundings.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR