



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2024

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3338873

36 Lindsey Street, Epping, CM16 6RE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Duncan Robertson against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/2524/23.
 - The development proposed is a single-storey rear extension and proposed driveway for ev charging.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling; and the effect of the proposal on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is an 'Arts and Crafts' style semi-detached two-storey dwelling, which faces Lindsey Street. It has a distinctive architectural character with some distinguishing features, including steeply sloping gables and prominent, decorative/feature chimneys. It's relatively small, cottage scale is also part of its character.
4. The appeal proposal is a resubmission of an earlier application (reference: EPF/1836/23). That included a first-floor dormer extension, which has now been omitted. The current proposal is to construct a single-storey 'wrap-around' rear/side extension that would provide kitchen/dining space, a utility and pantry area, plus a study and shower room. The proposed extension would be a large addition to the property and it would cover its entire width, in addition to the section at the side, which would also cover much of its length.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM9 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan (LP). This policy seeks to ensure (amongst other things) that the design of new development is of high quality that relates positively to local characteristics. This accords with paragraph 135 of The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (The Framework), which contains similar provisions.

6. I share the concerns of the Council about the extension. Part of the charm of the property is its 'cottage' type scale in addition to its architectural features. The proposed extension would be an overly large, incongruous, and overly dominant addition that would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM9 of the LP.
7. In reaching my decision, I have considered the fact that the property is not within a conservation area and that it has permitted development rights in place, which could permit rear and side extensions (subject to limitations). However, I have no further details regarding possible permitted development proposals and, in any event, I am required to determine the appeal proposal on its individual merits.

Highway Safety

8. The proposal also includes the provision of an on-site parking space within the existing front garden of the dwelling. This would involve the removal of part of a hedge that fronts the property. The provision of a parking space would reduce on-street parking and would enable electric vehicles to be charged on site. I also noted at my site visit that there are double yellow lines along the site frontage.
9. I read that the Council Officer's report gives some support to this aspect of the proposal. However, the submitted plans lack detail in terms of visibility splays and any manoeuvring space. At the time of my site visit, I observed that Lindsey Street was subject to a regular number of vehicle and pedestrian movements and, therefore, the effect of the proposal on highway safety requires some further consideration. Consequently, without further detail, I am unable to conclude on this issue.

Conclusion

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

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR