



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2024

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3342503

25 Lower Park Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 4NB

- 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 Jake Marcou against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
- The application reference is EPF/1815/23.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion with rear dormer and 5 roof lights to existing front roof slope, 1st floor side extension and alterations to existing single story rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with rear dormer and 5 roof lights to existing front roof slope, 1st floor side extension and alterations to existing single story rear extension at 25 Lower Park Road, Loughton, Essex, IG10 4NB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref EPF/1815/23, and the plans submitted with it, 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 plans: Block/Site Plan; Proposed Block/Site Plan; Existing Ground Floor Plan 2307-01b; Existing First Floor Plan 2307-02a; Existing Section 2307-03a; Existing Front Elevation 2307-04; Existing Rear Elevation 2307-05; Proposed Ground Floor Plan 2307-06e; Proposed 1st Floor Plan 2307-07d; Proposed Loft Floor Plan 2307-08d; Proposed Section 2307-09a; Existing Side Elevation 2307-10; Proposed Front Elevation 2307-11; Proposed Rear Elevation 2307-12b; Proposed Side Elevation 2307-13b; Existing Streetscene 2307-14; and Proposed Streetscene 2307-15 .
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof located in an established residential area. Dwellings along the road are varied in style and appearance, including a variety of materials and roof types.

4. The appeal proposal would result in a pair of semi-detached dwellings which would not be symmetrical, however, the wide variety of house types and roofscapes along the road would mean that the resultant form of development would not jar with the overall character and appearance of the locality.
5. Although the rear dormer would span almost the entire width of the extended property, it would be set above the eaves and below the ridgeline of the original house. Spaces between the buildings and generous rear gardens along Lower Park Road and Algers Road onto which the appeal property backs, means that the dormer would not be an overbearing feature when viewed from other properties or gardens close by. In terms of the scale of development, it would be comparable to the scale of buildings within the immediate area relative to their plot sizes.
6. Therefore, for the reasons set out, the proposal would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and the streetscape of Lower Park Road. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033, which, amongst other things, requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, having regard to matters including form, scale and massing around the site, building lines and the rhythm of local plot and building widths.

Other Matters

7. I note a third-party representation is concerned with overlooking and loss of light to a neighbouring landing window. I am satisfied that the high-level window in the side elevation of the dormer would not lead to undue loss of privacy. Furthermore, the loss of light to a non-habitable room is not a factor upon which I can place significant weight. Neither of these matters lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

Conditions

8. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions and have also noted the conditions that were set out in the officer's report. I have considered these having regard to the advice contained within the Planning Practice Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard time limit, I agree that a plans condition is necessary as this provides certainty. I also agree that a condition to ensure the development is finished in materials to match the existing is necessary in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
9. However, a condition to require obscured glazing in windows in the side elevation is not necessary as the only relevant window proposed is a high-level window in the dormer. Furthermore, wheel washing facilities and hours of construction conditions are not necessary or reasonable for developments of this scale and nature.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR