

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 August 2018

**by Les Greenwood MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 17 August 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/18/3204686**

**2 Gladstone Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex IG9 5SW**

- 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 C and G Developments against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
  - The application Ref PL/EPF/0339/18 was refused by notice dated 30 May 2018.
  - The development proposed is a 2 storey and single storey side and rear extension.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary matters

2. I understand that the proposal was amended during the application process. I have considered the appeal on the basis of those amended plans.
3. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published before the date of this decision. Having considered the role and content of the Framework in relation to this case, I see no need to re-consult the main parties about this change in national policy.

## Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the local area.

## Reasons

5. Gladstone Road is a steeply sloping street lined predominantly by traditionally designed houses, mainly in terraces, with some more modern infill. No 2 is a detached house sitting on a large triangular plot near to the bottom of the street and the junction with Russell Road. The proposal, following on from 2 dismissed appeals for a new house here, is to build a low 2 storey extension set down into the wide side garden and with a part flat roof, plus a single storey garage on the end.
6. Although No 2 appears to have been built fairly recently, its design, proportions, detailing and materials reflect those of the older houses on the street, so that it fits in well and complements local distinctiveness. The proposed extension, in contrast, would be a bulky, box-like addition, lacking in

articulation and with an awkwardly designed roof. Although small pitched roof sections would be included at the front and back in an effort to help the extension blend in, the central flat roof section would be prominent in views on the approach to the site from the junction with Russell Road. In these views in particular, the extension would appear as a contrived, unsympathetic feature in the street scene.

7. I note that the proposed extension would be set well down and set back slightly at the front so that it would be appropriately subsidiary to the main house, with the stepped roof levels following the slope of the street. Despite its large size and wide frontage, it would not look cramped on this sizeable plot, within its urban context. I note that the proposal was modified to meet concerns and was recommended for approval by the Council's planning team.
8. Even taking all of these points into account, my strong concerns about the proposed form and roof design lead me to conclude that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the house and the local area. It therefore conflicts with the aim of Epping Forest District Local Plan (January 1998) Policy DBE10, to ensure that extensions complement and where appropriate enhance the character of the street scene and the existing building including by giving close attention to form, detail and roof treatment. I also find conflict with the similar aims of Epping Forest District Local Plan (Submission Version 2017) Policies DM9 and DM10, though I give these policies only limited weight due to the early stage of this plan in the development plan process.
9. Objections have been raised by neighbours regarding the effect of the proposal on living conditions at houses on Russell Road and Gladstone Road. Although the Russell Road houses are set at a much lower level, the proposal has been carefully designed to minimise its impact. It would be set far enough away, would be low enough in height and would have high level roof lights at the back, so that there would be no undue effects on outlook, privacy or light at the Russell Road houses and their gardens. Due to its low height in particular, the effect on living conditions at other nearby houses in Gladstone Road would be minimal.
10. For the reasons set out above in respect of the main issue, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Les Greenwood*

INSPECTOR