
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3368795

8 Summerfield Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 4JF

- 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 O. Olayanju against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application ref is EPF/0696/25.
 - The development proposed is a partial single, partial double storey rear extension, lower ground floor extension, alteration to existing main and garage roof, removal of chimney, alteration to existing external staircase, internal reconfiguration, and all associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a detached, two-storey property with an attic level and a lower ground floor garage to the side. It is set back from and facing the road and has a steeply pitched gable roof. The lower half of the dwelling has exposed red brick with dentilled detailing, above which it is rendered with mock Tudor framing. This is a pleasant and original aspect of the street scene. It is reflected in a large number of others, lending a coherence and high-quality consistency to the street, unifying a collection of architecturally varied dwellings. The quality of the street's consistency is also reflected in relief where there is large scale, which allows such buildings to be read less prominently and maintain a structured order to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposals would build out the lower ground floor to contain living accommodation and widen the first-floor level to create three clear storeys; a situation which is repeated elsewhere along this side of the road. However, the eventual design's scale would be emphasised by the use of an almost complete block like mass. Along with the regrettable loss of the locally distinctive mock Tudor detailing, the eventual building would lack relief and locally characteristic design features that would make it unacceptably stand out in the street scene, adversely

affecting the quality of the area's cohesion and collective identity. I appreciate that the design, as a whole, is seeking to depart from a more traditional appearance through the use of altered glazing styles, larger and a greater number of windows and a brick and render exterior, but, for the above reasons, the totality of the proposals would be inappropriate for this building in amongst the ones it finds itself.

6. No.1 Hillcrest Road is a modern building which appears to have either replaced or extended a previous bungalow. I do not have the precise details of what was on this site in terms of design or its appearance, but neither that nor the current dwelling is read as part of the same collective as the appeal property. The design approach taken there does not therefore necessarily justify the proposed development. The other cited examples are of buildings within the district, but in fundamentally different locations. My findings are therefore unchanged.
7. The proposed development would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan (2023) which seeks to ensure that all new development must contribute to the distinctive character of the local area. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework which sets out, amongst other things, that development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and layout.

Other Matters

8. The Council's handling of the application and preapplication advice are not matters which can influence my assessment of the proposal, nor is it my role to resolve them. Similarly, expenses occurred during the planning process are met by the applicant.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend the appeal is dismissed.

E Clifford

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 dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR