



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2014

by Grahame Gould BA MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 2 December 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/14/2227421
18 Stradbroke Grove, Buckhurst Hill, IG9 5PF

- 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 Michael Crawford against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/1248/14 was refused by notice dated 6 August 2014.
 - The development is 'proposed two storey rear and side extension. Proposed single storey rear extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a part one and part two storey rear extension, first floor side extensions and enlargement of roof with rear second floor dormer window at 18 Stradbroke Grove, Buckhurst Hill, IG9 5PF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/EPF/1248/14, dated 22 May 2014, 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 the following approved plans SCEF: 13/04; 13/05; 13/06; 13/07; 13/08; 13/09; 14/20 Rev A; and 14/23 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development adopted by the Council, which the appellant has not objected to, more accurately describes the proposed works and I have therefore based my formal decision on this, albeit that I have pluralised the reference to the proposed first floor side extensions.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 16 and 20 Stradbroke Grove, with particular regard to any sense of overbearingness.

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 18) is an extended two storey, detached house and is within a street that is characterised by a mixture of houses and bungalows.
5. The appeal proposal would involve the construction of a part single and part two storey rear extension and first floor side extensions. It is also proposed that within the roof area of the extended house additional habitable accommodation would be formed, which would be illuminated by a rear dormer and rooflights.
6. No 16 has two flank windows facing towards No 18's side elevation and the boundary between these properties is marked by a fence, which I estimate to be around 1.8 metres high. The outlook from No 16's side windows is therefore dominated by the presence of No 18, given the latter's height and the limited physical separation between these properties. While the proposed first floor extension on the southern side of No 18 would add to this property's mass, I find, given the aforementioned context, that no appreciable additional overbearingness would arise from within No 16.
7. I similarly find that relationship between No 16's side windows and the additions to No 18 would be such that no unacceptable loss of light would be experienced from within No 16.
8. In terms of views of the proposed additions from within No 16's the rear garden, given No 16 has a rear projection along part of the common boundary between the properties and the nature of the boundary treatment, I am not persuaded that the extensions would be visually dominant when viewed from within No 16's garden.
9. No 20 has secondary kitchen and bathroom windows at ground and first floor levels that have an outlook towards the proposed additions on the northern side of No 18. However, given the distance these additions would be from the adjoining windows at No 20, I find that the outlook from within No 20 would not be materially harmed. Views of the proposed extensions would be possible from within No 20's garden area, however when regard is paid to their offset from the shared boundary and their hipped roof form, which helps to reduce these additions mass, I am of the view that the alterations to No 18 would not be domineering when seen from within No 20's garden.
10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the occupiers of Nos 16 and 20 would not experience any unacceptable sense of overbearingness from the appeal development. I therefore find there to be no conflict with the objectives of Policy DBE9 of Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998, which seeks to ensure that extensions, amongst other things, do not give rise to adverse visual impacts for the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conditions

11. Other than the standard time limit condition, I find it necessary that the permitted development should be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and that matching external materials should be used in the interests of the proper planning of the area. I have therefore imposed conditions to this effect.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Grahame Gould

INSPECTOR