



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3369724

38 Park View, Chigwell, Essex IG7 5DF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (1990 Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sunil Bagga against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/0028/25.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion, single storey rear extension and new outhouse in back garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area; and
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) and relevant development plan policies.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The property is part of a gated residential estate where many of the dwellings face an open green area. The dwellings are largely a mix of 2 and 3 storeys in a similar style that results in a pleasant and unified character and appearance. While there are a number of types of roof profiles prevalent in the estate, these are generally uninterrupted by dormer windows. This contributes to the sense of architectural unity within the estate.
4. The front elevation of the existing dwelling has an uninterrupted roof profile except for a modest gable feature. It is therefore in keeping with the style and roof forms of the surrounding houses. This results in a pleasant appearance which contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The property at No 45 Park View has a front dormer in the roof. However, this appears to be the only one in the group of properties facing the green. It is in a discrete location in the estate and is not readily noticeable. As such, front dormer windows are not typical of the area and do not form a substantial part of the character of the area.

6. The proposed front dormer would be set down from the ridge of the main roof and would be around 3m wide. However, its projection and width would visually dominate the modest gable feature below it, drawing the eye away from the balanced composition of the front elevation. As such it would appear incongruous when viewed against the rest of the property. The proposed front dormer would therefore have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building.

7. The proposed dormer window would be noticeable from the surrounding area given that the property is sited in a prominent position facing the green in view of surrounding houses. It would appear out of keeping with the largely uninterrupted roof forms in the vicinity. The proposed front dormer would therefore adversely affect the attractive unified character and appearance of the surrounding area.

8. Consequently, the proposed front dormer would harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Therefore, it would conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One Adopted March 2023 (LP) which seeks, among other things, high quality development that relate positively to their context.

Inappropriateness

9. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt. Paragraph 154 of the Framework sets out that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of a number of exceptions apply. These include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. LP Policy DM4 broadly aligns with the Framework in this respect.

10. The proposal includes an outbuilding as well as a single storey rear extension and loft conversion with front and rear dormer windows. The proposed outbuilding would not be physically attached to the house. However, the matter of whether it would amount to an extension for the purpose of paragraph 154 of the Framework is a matter of fact and degree. In this instance, given the close proximity of the proposed outbuilding to the garage and dwelling as well as the proposed uses including home office, it would constitute a normal domestic adjunct and would therefore be an extension for the purposes of paragraph 154c of the Framework and LP Policy DM4.

11. The existing site comprises a two storey dwelling and single storey garage near the rear garden. There is no evidence before me to indicate that there have been alterations or extensions since the erection of the original buildings on the site.

12. The proposed rear extension and outbuilding would both be single storey, have a modest height and footprint, and have gently sloping pitched roofs. Therefore, the increase in floorspace and volume would be modest when compared with the original buildings on the property. Accordingly, the proposed development would not constitute disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

13. Consequently, the proposed development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, it would not conflict with the LP Policy DM4 which seeks to protect the Green Belt from inappropriate development. It would also not conflict with the Framework in this particular respect.

Other Matters

14. I note the evidence regarding improved family accommodation and promoting an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes. However, any benefits in this

respect would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.

15. I acknowledge the evidence regarding permitted development rights. However, further details, such as a certificate of lawful use or development granted under section 191 or 192 of the 1990 Act, are not before me to establish whether there is a realistic prospect of any such scheme being implemented. Accordingly, this matter has not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above the proposed development would conflict with the development plan as a whole and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR