



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by **P B Jarvis DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3375074

41 The Lindens Loughton IG10 3HS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ivan Gill against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref. is EPF/1675/25.
 - The proposed development is a front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch at 41 The Lindens, Loughton IG10 3HS in accordance with the terms of application reference EPF/1675/25 and 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 plan: 1058.01 Revision C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issues

2. The effect on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street scene
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, No. 40.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling located on a modern residential estate. The dwelling is set back from the road frontage behind a driveway which is shared with two adjoining properties which are located to the north and north-east of the appeal site.
4. Number 40, the nearest, is sited directly to the north of No. 41. The occupants of this property currently use a path which runs to the front of No. 41 to access their property, the front door of which is located close to the common boundary of the two properties.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed porch would have a lean-to roof and would protrude 1.6 metres to the front of the dwelling on the appeal site. It would occupy less than half the width of the front elevation of the host dwelling and would respect its design and appearance using matching materials. In my view it would be a proportionate and complimentary addition to the property.
6. Due to its relatively modest size and considerable set back from the road frontage it would not appear as an unduly prominent addition and in visual terms would be acceptable within the wider street scene within the immediate vicinity of which there are a number of similarly sized front porches.
7. Overall, there would be no conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest Local Plan (2023) (EFLP) which seeks high quality design that contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area in all development and in respect of residential extensions seeks to ensure that they respect the form, period and detailing of the host building, using matching or complementary materials.
8. Similarly, the proposal would satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to achieve well designed places and development that is sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

9. The proposed porch would extend over part of the existing front garden area and partly over the pedestrian path. The side elevation of the porch would be around 2.5 metres from the front door of No.40 which faces towards the appeal site.
10. Whilst the side of the porch would face towards the front of No. 40 and be present in views from it, given its depth, height and separation distance, it would not be overly dominant nor unduly block any light. I note that it is only the front door and a small bathroom window of this property that face towards No. 41 and thus no habitable rooms would be affected.
11. The occupant of No. 40 also contends that the pedestrian access to their property would be obstructed as the porch would partly extend over the front path which is used to access their front door. The appellant has provided evidence in the form of a title plan which show that the land in question is wholly within their ownership. It does not appear to show any right of access for the neighbouring property but if such right did exist this would be a separate matter which is not directly relevant to nor affected by any grant of planning permission. I also note that part of the path would remain, albeit narrower, and the adjoining occupant would continue to have access via the area to the front of their garage.
12. I therefore find that there would be no unacceptably harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property. The proposal would thus comply with EFLP Policy DM9 and with the Framework which seeks development that, in addition to the above, creates places with a high standard of amenity.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit and condition to refer to the approved plans in the interest of clarity, a condition to require matching materials is also necessary in the interests of the visual amenity of the area.

Conclusion

14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P B Jarvis

INSPECTOR