
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2016

by **John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 27th July 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/W/16/3146347
33 Chapel Road, Epping, Essex CM16 5DS

- 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 Chris King against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref EPF/2484/15, dated 3 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing two storey dwelling house and garage, the construction of a new two storey residential building with loft and basement accommodation containing 3x1b and 4x2b apartments, with associated car, bicycle parking and refuse facilities.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, the proposed development would be a detached building which would comprise of seven separate self-contained units of accommodation arranged over four floors which would include one in the basement and one in the roof space. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The street scene is made up of a number of different dwelling designs but they are for the most part conventional two storey types. Typically they have shallow front gardens which abut the back edge of the pavement and as such parking is generally on the street. Whilst buildings are arranged closely together they are mostly detached with a narrow width and a vertical emphasis to their general appearance.
 5. The proposed development would share similar period design features to other buildings in the street scene such as, for example, forward projecting bay windows and a hipped roof. These details would however be presented on a building which would be of a substantially larger scale than the existing
-

- dwelling, the immediate neighbour (Number 31 Chapel Road) and other dwellings in the street scene.
6. The scale and mass of the proposed development would therefore have a dominating visual effect over the immediate neighbour and other buildings in the street scene, an effect which is exacerbated by the increased width, spacing between fenestration and single height roof span. Whilst I accept that the proposed development would not be significantly taller than surrounding buildings, the contrasting horizontal emphasis and disproportionate scale of the proposed development in relation to other buildings in the street scene would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. I therefore consider that the proposed development would be contrary to saved Policies DBE1, CP2 and CP3 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998 and Alterations 2006. These Policies seek to ensure that, inter alia, new development respects its setting in terms of scale, proportion and massing, safeguards and enhances the setting, character and townscape of the urban environment and respects the character and environment of the locality.
 8. The proposed development would also be contrary to section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, inter alia, encourages the use of good quality and contextually appropriate design which is visually attractive and responds to local character.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's comments in respect of the changes that have been made to the design and overall size of the proposed development following a previous refusal of planning permission. Whilst I do not have the previously refused design before me for consideration, I have considered the proposed development on its own merits and concluded that it would, by virtue of its scale and massing, cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
10. I further acknowledge that the sloping nature of the street as it runs downhill to the north west of the appeal site does give a stepped appearance to the street scene. However, this would not mitigate the effect of the large scale and mass of the proposed development when it would be read in the context of the more modest scale of buildings around it. This would not therefore justify allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR