



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by F Harrison BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3370419

17 Chester Road, Chigwell, Essex IG7 6AH

- 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 Dr Kiranjit Kaur Nijjer against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/0724/25.
 - The development proposed is for ground, first and second floor extensions with internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for ground, first and second floor extensions with internal alterations at 17 Chester Road, Chigwell, Essex IG7 6AH in accordance with the terms of the application, ref EPF/0724/25, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 3956-11, 3956-10 and 3956-LP1.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area; and b) the living conditions for the occupants of 15 Chester Road, with particular regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling situated within a suburban residential area, beyond the rear garden is open countryside. Many of the surrounding dwellings have been altered and extended resulting in a varied appearance within the street as a whole.

5. The appeal dwelling has a distinctive front elevation with a monopitch roof for the porch which adjoins an eave of the projecting front gable. The attached garage to the side also has a monopitch roof, which together with the roof of the porch emulates a wide front gable. It has a strong degree of symmetry with the neighbouring dwelling at No 15. Although the proposal would add to the overall mass and scale of the dwelling, the appearance of the front elevation would not alter significantly as the wide front gable would resemble the existing character of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the symmetry with No 15 would be largely retained.
6. The proposal would introduce a crown roof, incorporating a considerable proportion of flat roof that would alter the side profile of the dwelling, which would be visible in glimpsed views from the street. However, within the surrounding area there are examples of dwellings with similar crown roof profiles, including at the neighbouring property at No 19. The proposal therefore would not be an incongruous feature within the street scene.
7. Despite the proposal resulting in the loss of some legibility of the existing rear elevation, it would be seen in the context of No 19 which has a substantial rear extension and in the presence of other similar extensions nearby. As such, it would not appear disproportionate or unsympathetic to the host dwelling or surrounding area when viewed from the neighbouring gardens and would accord with paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks development that functions well and maintains a sense of place.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and accords with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2011-2033 Part One (2023) (EFDLP). Amongst other things, this policy seeks development that achieves high quality design and relates positively to its locality.

Living Conditions

9. No 15 has patio doors from the kitchen facing directly towards the appeal site. There are also patio doors on the rear elevation facing the garden. The patio area wraps around the side and rear of No 15 and is partially covered by a pergola to the side. The outlook from the rear windows and garden of No 15 is relatively open with views across the garden and countryside beyond.
10. The appeal proposal would be particularly visible above the boundary fence from the side patio doors at No 15, although I note this is not the only view from the kitchen. It would also be visible from the lounge, first and second floor bedroom windows, but this would be in oblique views. Nevertheless, the proposal would not be dominant in views and the main aspect from the rear windows towards the garden and countryside would generally be retained.
11. Whilst the proposal would result in a visual change particularly when viewed from the side patio, the set back position of the first and second floor extension and the proposed hipped roof would reduce the perceived mass of development along the shared boundary, minimising its effects and ensuring that outlook from No 15 would not be significantly diminished. Furthermore, this part of the patio has a generous width to the shared boundary and wraps around the property, providing a range of potential seating areas for the occupants.

12. As a result of the orientation of the appeal property to No 15, I acknowledge that there will be some loss of daylight and potential overshadowing to part of No 15's patio area and garden during certain times of the day and year. Notwithstanding this, given the generous depth and width of the garden, overall, the occupants of No 15 would receive good levels of daylight/sunlight, as required by EFDLP Policy DM9.
13. The windows and patio doors on the rear elevation of No 15 are not unduly small and have an open aspect. While the proposal would obscure more of the sky than the existing situation, the reduction in the amount of daylight/sunlight No 15 would receive would not be significant and would not diminish the living conditions of the occupants. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Framework paragraph 135 which seeks development with a high standard of amenity for existing occupiers.
14. Overall, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions for the occupants of No 15, with particular regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight. It would therefore accord with EFDLP Policy DM9 which requires proposals to not result in an over-bearing form of development that impacts the outlook of neighbouring occupiers, and to provide good sunlight, daylight and open aspects to adjacent buildings and land.

Conditions

15. The standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans are necessary for clarity.
16. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the proposal to match those used in the existing dwelling is necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above, the proposal accords with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR