



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3374161

28 Princesfield Road, Waltham Abbey, EN9 3PH

- 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 and Mrs Cassidy against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application ref. is EPF/0896/25.
 - The development proposed is a single storey, pitched roof, side extension providing downstairs WC, utility & storage space, and an internal staircase and loft extension to provide a new master bedroom, ensuite and storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the internal staircase and loft extension to provide a new master bedroom, ensuite and storage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey, pitched roof, side extension providing downstairs WC, utility & storage space and planning permission is granted for a single storey, pitched roof, side extension providing downstairs WC, utility & storage space at 28 Princesfield Road, Waltham Abbey, EN9 3PH in accordance with the terms of the application, ref. EPF/0896/25, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the ground floor side extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, SK01, SK02, SK03, SK04, SK05, SK06, SK07, SK08, SK09, SK10, SK11, SK12, SK13 & SK14 only in so far as they permit development of a single storey, pitched roof, side extension providing downstairs WC, utility & storage space.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey dwellinghouse at the end of a row of four terraced houses in total. It's ground floor sits below road level and there are steps down from the road to the front door of the house. It has a pitched roof with a plain gable-shaped flank wall on its north eastern flank. Its neighbouring property to the north east (no.30 Princesfield Road) is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings. These two semis have their frontages facing in a more north/north-westerly direction than the appeal property and its adjacent terraced houses.
4. The proposed development is in two distinct parts. A single storey side extension with a monopitched roof over it is proposed, which would be used as a utility room with new WC and storage. It would have two skylights, a rear window and an entrance door from the front of the house. The second element of the proposal is a loft extension with an internal staircase up to a new master bedroom, ensuite and storage. It would have a velux type window in the roof slope of the front of the house.
5. The proposed ground floor side extension would be modest in size and would involve a shed being demolished to make room for it. The long flank of the extension would be slanted reflecting the fact that the plot is not rectangular. The shape of the proposed extension allows for a passageway to be created from the frontage land to the rear garden, adjacent to the boundary line with no.30 Princesfield Road. The design therefore steps away from the common boundary and, being single storey and monopitched, would not be overbearing or intrusive for occupants of no.30.
6. Furthermore, the front of the proposed extension would be partially concealed by the land that rises up to the road in front of it. Notwithstanding that, its modest form and plain design would not conflict with the character or appearance of the host dwelling or wider area. I note that the Council has not raised any objections to the proposed side extension. Having considered all material considerations relating to the proposed side extension I conclude that it would not harm any planning interests including the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the area. It would not conflict with policy DM9 (A to K) of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One (adopted 2023).
7. Turning to the second main element of the proposed development, the loft conversion would include a flat roof being created below the ridgeline of the main roof so that living space could be provided at the rear on a third storey. The rear wall of the rear dormer extension would be flush with the existing rear wall and a double window with Juliette balcony would be inserted into the dormer with a second smaller window facing the rear garden. Whilst the proposed new fenestration would align with existing rear fenestration, the resulting appearance of the roof extension would be excessively bulky and top heavy. It would not step in either above the eaves or from each end of the existing roof. The original design of the host dwelling would be obscured, and the rear elevation and the upper flank elevation would have a visually unattractive and domineering appearance. The double window with Juliette balcony would contribute to the domineering appearance.
8. There would be glimpses of the bulky resulting flank elevation from the public realm which would detract from generally uniform streetscene. Furthermore, the proposed rear roof would have an awkward and disruptive physical and visual relationship with the other simple rear roofs of the terrace (22, 24 & 26).

9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a small number of other dwellings in the immediate area with loft conversions with dormer windows and I noted these on my site visit. However, I am not informed as to whether or not these are extensions which were expressly permitted by the Council, were constructed using permitted development rights or were unauthorised developments. Nevertheless, even if I attached weight to these being permissions which the Council had expressly allowed, none in my view have impacts on the host dwelling or area as deleterious as the appeal proposal loft extension would be likely to have. I have determined the appeal proposal on its own particular and individual merits as I am obliged to do, and I find that unacceptable harm to the host dwelling and the surrounding area would result from the proposed loft conversion.
10. I have borne in mind the current occupants' strong desire and need for additional sleeping space, but this does not outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposed loft conversion.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposed loft extension would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area and would be contrary to policy DM9(A), (D) & (E) of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One (adopted 2023).

Conclusion

12. The two main elements of the development proposed as part of the appeal would clearly function separately and are not physically linked or dependent on each other. Consequently, I have concluded that a split decision is appropriate in this case.
13. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the internal staircase and loft extension to provide a new master bedroom, ensuite and storage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single storey, pitched roof side extension providing downstairs WC, utility & storage space.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector