



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2025 by S Jamieson

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3363292

62 Forest Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 1EQ

- 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 Clifford Guy against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/0005/25.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Ground floor rear extension with two sky lights. Ensuite at first floor passing 45 degree rule (with pitched roof)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for ground floor rear extension with two sky lights. Ensuite at first floor (with pitched roof) at 62 Forest Road Loughton, Essex IG10 1EQ, in accordance with the terms of application, Ref EPF/0005/25, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (1:1250); 201 A (Proposed Block Plan); 202 A (Proposed Floor Plans); 203 A (Proposed Floor Plans); 204 A (Proposed Elevation 01); 205 A (Proposed Elevation 02); 206 A (Proposed Section); and 207 A (Proposed 3D Views).
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The planning application form refers to 'Mr Mr Cliff' as the applicant. However, it has been clarified during the appeal process that this was an error, and that the application form should have stated that Mr Clifford Guy was the applicant. It has been confirmed that Mr Clifford Guy is also the appellant and the banner heading for this appeal decision therefore reflects this.

4. The description on the application form includes 'passing 45 degree rule' which is not a description of development. This has therefore been removed from the description in the appeal decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area, mainly characterised by two-storey, semi-detached and terraced properties. The appeal dwelling forms part of a terrace which due to its modest scale, some shared period features and its slight setback from the road, has a cottage-like appearance to the front, as do many of the properties on this part of Forest Road. To the rear of the appeal terrace extensions and alterations are commonplace, including single and two-storey extensions, conservatories, dormer windows, Juliet balconies and changes to fenestration and façade treatments.
7. I accept there are local examples of dual-pitched roofs on rear projections typical of Victorian typologies with first-floor eaves often set below the eaves of the main roof. However, there is notable variety in terms of the height and pitch of roofs at first-floor level, and I observed examples of first-floor roof forms sited below, level with and above the eaves of their respective host dwelling including some flat roofed two-storey rear projections.
8. The array of roof forms to rear elevations within the area indicates that some variation in roof design can be accommodated, particularly where the overall design of an extension is sympathetic to local character. While the eaves of the first-floor extension would sit level with the eaves of the main roof, the ridge of the proposal would sit low in the roofscape and close to the eaves. In that regard, it would suitably reflect the scale and form of many of the other two-storey projections in the area. Together with its modest width and depth, and its matching materials, the proposal would be a discreet addition to the rear of the host dwelling. Consequently, it would sit harmoniously within its context and reflect the mixed character and appearance of the area.
9. The Council found that the proposed single-storey extension would be acceptable in character and appearance terms. I am also satisfied that it is of a size and design which would comfortably assimilate into its surroundings.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would comply with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Council Local Plan – Part One (2023) which requires development to be of a high quality of design and relate positively to their locality in terms of height, form, scale and massing.

Other Matters

11. I acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the effect of the first-floor extension on living conditions at 64 Forest Road. From my observations, there would be sufficient separation between this element of the proposal and the neighbouring windows and garden to ensure acceptable levels of light and outlook would be retained for occupiers of No 64. The evidence also suggests that with regards to the attached dwelling at 60 Forest Road, the proposed development would be

compliant with the 'BRE 45 degree rule'. There is no objective evidence before me to suggest that I should reach an alternative view to the Council in terms of there being no material harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

12. A boiler flue and guttering are not included on the submitted drawings and it is beyond the remit of this appeal to consider the potential location of such. In the event that such fixtures were to overhang neighbouring land, this would be a private matter between landowners.
13. Any inconvenience for occupiers of neighbouring properties relating to construction of the proposed development would likely be short-term and a private matter between neighbouring parties as would any damage caused to neighbouring property or access issues to facilitate development works.
14. There is no objective evidence before me to suggest that the proposed en-suite would not be useable and the Council has not raised this as a reason for refusal. In any case, it is not within the scope of this appeal to consider the suitability of the internal layout of the en-suite.

Conditions

15. A standard implementation condition (1) is required, along with a condition (2) listing the approved plans to provide certainty over what has been approved. In addition, a condition (3) requiring matching external materials is also necessary in order to ensure that the development harmonises with the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. The proposed development accords with the development plan and for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR