



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3357645

30 Courtland Drive, Chigwell IG7 6PW

- 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 Nej and Ajda D'jela against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/1733/24.
 - The development proposed is a double storey front extension, conversion of garage, new roof canopy at front entrance, new front steps, new fenestration to the front elevation, first floor side extension, part first floor rear extension, ground floor rear extension, first floor balcony with privacy side screen, raising of the roof to facilitate a loft conversion with associated rear dormers and front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is located in an attractive verdant residential area, characterised by its large, detached dwellings, with substantial gaps between each. They are set back from a mature tree-lined verge and pavement. Buildings are individual and include elements of mock-tudor, render, hung tiles, double roof pitches and various dormer window designs. The majority incorporate, through these elements, a strong impression of relief and spaciousness which lends a pleasant consistency and quality to the street scene and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The various elements of the appeal scheme would combine to result in something of a block like building, lacking relief and thus visual interest. This would jar against the qualities of the street scene as I have set them out. Furthermore, the proposals would extend closer to the boundary with Number 32, resulting in a narrowing of the existing gap and thus appearing cramped, reducing the pleasant spaciousness. Similarly, several additions are proposed on the rear elevation, including two large flat roofed dormer windows, a two-storey extension and single storey element

across the remainder of the rear elevation that enables balconies at the first-floor level, consequently resulting in bulky additions, out of proportion with the host dwelling.

6. Number 12 Courtland Drive (No 12) has been extended and was, it would seem, a remodel project akin to the appeal scheme. I have acknowledged the street scene has distinction and variety, such that the works to No 12 were deemed acceptable by the Council. That said, such variety would not, as I have explained, be sufficient to accommodate the result of the proposed development. Number 46 was a replacement dwelling and whilst of some substance and scale has two forward projecting gables, part hips to the roofscape, a recessed first floor section to the front and two dormer windows in the forward facing roof. These elements combine to reflect the street scene's quality in design relief.
7. In regard to the scheme at appeal for Number 32, this has since been allowed and whilst the changes thereto were evidently substantial, there is no indication that it was allowed for the same reasons that the appeal scheme before me is being resisted. It was considered on its own merits and context, as has this appeal. Taken together, this and the above examples do not change my findings.
8. Consequently, the appeal proposals would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, they would conflict with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest District Local Plan 2023 as the proposed extensions would fail to achieve a high-quality design, relate positively to their context, or respect and complement the form, setting, period and detailing of the host dwelling. In addition, the appeal proposals would conflict with paragraphs 131 and 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) due to their detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding built development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sara Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR