
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3372060

62 Wellfields, Loughton, Essex IG10 1NY

- 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 Y Chaudhary against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application ref. is EPF/1249/25.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a two-storey, semi-detached house which has a pitched roof and a front gable. It is set back from the highway and has a long rear garden. The plot widens in size to the rear. The appeal property has a single-storey flat-roofed extension, which extends across part of the rear elevation, and a pergola between the house and boundary to the side. The house is set on higher land than the unattached neighbouring house. The area is residential in character, consisting of two-storey houses, some with accommodation in the roof.
4. Although the roof of the proposed extension would be lower than the existing ridge, the proposed two-storey extension would be wider than the house and the part wrapping around its side would be seen from the street. The roof pitch on the proposed side extension would be shallower than that of the facing gable, in the context of which it would be seen. The significant mass of the rear extension would also be visible from rear gardens along the street and those backing on to them. Both effects would be accentuated by the elevated position of the house.
5. Even though the proposed extension has a lower ridge height and is set back from the front elevation, its effect on the character and appearance of the area and host property would be to introduce an element that would be discordant with both the host and other similar houses in the area as viewed from the street. Whilst views from the rear are private, it would also create significant, incongruous bulk viewed from there, changing the appearance of the house considerably.
6. I observed on my site visit that the unattached neighbouring house has been significantly extended, including into the roof space. I also observed that its roof

form, unusual within the area, was clearly evident from the rear garden of the appeal site, as it must be from others nearby, and somewhat visible from the street. Whilst the circumstances in which that came to be are not before me, the roof in that case is less visible than the proposed side extension would be from the street, and its lower position reduces the impact of its massing. Accordingly, it is materially different to the appeal scheme before me.

7. Overall, the proposed extension would appear as a bulky and discordant addition to the house. It would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy DM9 of the Part One Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033, adopted March 2023. This policy amongst other things requires that proposals relate positively to their context and draw on local character.

Other Matters

8. Whilst the proposal would provide enlarged and improved living accommodation for the occupant, I do not find that this private benefit outweighs the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR