



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/25/3372556

55 Spring Grove, Loughton, Essex IG10 4QD

- 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 Tom Carter against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application ref is EPF/0840/25.
 - The development proposed is for a proposed first floor extension and loft rooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a proposed first floor extension and loft rooms at 55 Spring Grove, Loughton, Essex IG10 4QD in accordance with the terms of the application, ref EPF/0840/25, 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 no's, CSEF/25/03A, CSEF/25/03B, CSEF/25/05A
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Spring Grove is a suburban residential road with an undulating character. Whilst there are clusters of dwellings within the street that are relatively consistent in terms of their architectural style, there is a significant proportion of dwellings that have been substantially altered and extended.
5. The site comprises of a detached chalet style dwelling of part one and half and part two storey situated towards the brow of the hill, increasing its visibility and prominence in the surrounding area.

6. I note that the appeal proposal is a revised scheme following a previously refused planning application for a 'first and second floor extension and a single storey rear extension' (ref EPF/0963/20) which was subsequently dismissed on appeal (ref APP/J1535/D/20/3259157). I have not been provided with the specific details of that application. However, the Council's Officer report suggests that the previous concerns relating to the gabled roof have been addressed in the revised scheme with a hipped roof providing a more sympathetic relationship with the surrounding context and reducing the overall visual bulk of the building.
7. The Council has raised concerns regarding the three storey gabled element of the proposal stating it appears unduly dominant and visually intrusive.
8. The surrounding area features a mix of one and half, two and three storey dwellings. Some of the dwellings with dormers resemble that of three storey buildings. The neighbouring property at No.53 Spring Grove is a Swiss chalet style over three floors. A proposal for a three storey dwelling would not be out of context within the surrounding setting.
9. The visual impact of the full three storey gable element from within the street scene is lessened by the interruption of the ground floor porch canopy which breaks up the vertical elevation reducing the overall bulky appearance. I observed during my site visit that pitched roof gables are prevalent within the street scene and the proposal would emulate this characteristic feature, further reducing its prominence.
10. The proposal would not appear to be overbearing or an oppressive form of development, particularly given that it would be compatible with the pattern of height variation that follows the change in land levels of the road. The proposal would harmonise with the rhythm of the roofscape and as such it would not appear visually intrusive within the skyline.
11. The Council raised no objection to the proposed pitch roof dormers to the front and rear of the dwelling stating they integrate appropriately within the roofscape. I find no reason to disagree.
12. For the reasons given above, I find the proposal would not appear visually dominant or incongruous within the street scene and would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan (2023) which seeks high quality design in all new development that contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.

Conditions

13. The standard conditions relating to the commencement of development and a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary as this provides clarity.
14. In the interests of protecting the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area, a condition requiring the external materials of the extension to match those used in the existing dwelling is imposed.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed. The proposal would accord with the development plan, when read as a whole. Material considerations,

including the National Planning Policy Framework do not indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR