



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3359747

27 Gladstone Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 5SW

- 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 Lisa Bruno against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/2151/24.
 - The development proposed is a single storey infill extension and internal alteration works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey infill extension and internal alteration works at 27 Gladstone Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 5SW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref EPF/2151/24, and the plans submitted with it, 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;
2417 TP-01 Site Plan, Existing and Proposed Floor Plans and Existing and Proposed Elevations
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would provide satisfactory living conditions for existing and future occupants, with particular regard to daylight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 27 Gladstone Road is a modest two-storey detached dwelling, positioned close to the highway within a mixed residential street scene. The house is characterised by a front gabled main roof, with subordinate flat roofed ground and first floor projections to the rear. At ground level, the principal elevation contains a partially

glazed entrance door together with two matching rectangular sash windows. Internally, the kitchen is located within the rear outshot, whilst the rear living room and front lounge/dining room have been opened up such to function as a single connected space, notwithstanding a centrally positioned fireplace.

5. At the time of my visit, the rear window serving the living room had been blocked up in accordance with the proposed plans, though the infill extension and other alterations had not been commenced. It is the removal of this window that the Council object to, based on a loss of light to habitable space. However, the blocking up of this window in isolation is an alteration that does not require planning permission.
6. Overall, the scheme would result in less natural light to the living room area than if the rear facing window were retained. However, due to a combination of the open plan layout of the living room and lounge, the limited depth of this combined space, and the substantial size of the existing front glazing, the living room would still benefit from an acceptable level of daylight, as I observed at the site visit. I am also satisfied that a sufficient level of ventilation utilising the existing windows would be retained to address the altered internal space. As such, the development would not materially harm the living conditions of occupiers of the dwelling.
7. On this basis, I conclude that the development would provide satisfactory living conditions for existing and future occupants, with particular regard to daylight. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One, which seeks high quality design, with development proposals required to provide good daylight as part of taking account of occupier amenity, comfort and wellbeing within their design and layout.

Conditions

8. In addition to conditions related to the timeliness of the development and the identification of plans, a condition is necessary requiring materials to match those used on the existing house to secure high quality design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR