



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2025

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3355128

11A Loughton Way, Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 6AE

- 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 Jim Singer against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/1815/24.
 - The development proposed is enlargement of first floor roof space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for enlargement of first floor roof space (retrospective) at 11A Loughton Way, Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 6AE. The permission is granted in accordance with the terms of the application Ref EPF/1815/24, dated 4 September 2024.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the development has been undertaken, I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that it involves an application for retrospective planning permission. The proposal includes some amendments to the built development, which differs from a recently approved application for extensions to the appeal property¹, most notably in terms of the upper level side extension.
1. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published on 12 December 2024. The content of the revised Framework has been considered but in light of the facts in this case it does not alter my conclusion.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow in a residential road of predominantly detached and semi-detached two storey dwellings. The surrounding area is residential in character.
5. The side extension continues the built form of the original dwelling, with the same roof form and ridge height. The extended dwelling is, however, of modest size, including its frontage width and height. Moreover, the appeal property is of similar

¹ Ref EPF/2269/23.

size to Nos 9 and 9A, the other side of No 11, and the surrounding context is predominantly large two storey dwellings, including No 13 next to the appeal property. As such, No 11A remains one of the smallest properties in the street scene, even in its extended form and, therefore, it does not appear incongruous in this residential setting.

6. While the side extension creates a wider overall frontage than that of the adjoining dwelling, No 11, the difference is not so great as to unbalance the pair of modest dwellings or otherwise appear incongruous. A gap is retained between the extension and No 13, which is characteristic of the separation between properties within the street scene, including between Nos 11 and 9A the other side of the appeal property. Consequently, the extended dwelling does not appear cramped or a form of overdevelopment. The position of the extension allows for views through to the rear and a good degree of separation between the neighbouring dwellings.
7. Therefore, for these reasons, I conclude that the side extension does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, it is not contrary to Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 (2023), which requires all new development to achieve a high quality of design and to contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, the appeal should succeed. As the development has been undertaken, the standard conditions concerning commencement, adherence to plans and matching materials are unnecessary.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR