



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2012

by **C J Leigh BSC(HONS) MPhil MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 23 November 2012

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/12/2183635

82 Princes Road, BUCKHURST HILL, Essex, IG9 5DZ

- 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 R Commerford against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/1045/12 was refused by notice dated 24 July 2012.
 - The development proposed is two storey side & rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for a two storey side & rear extension at 82 Princes Road, BUCKHURST HILL, Essex, IG9 5DZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/EPF/1045/12, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) Before the first occupation of the extension hereby permitted the 1.8m high privacy screen shown in drawings 3T and 4T shall be erected and fitted with obscured glass and shall thereafter be permanently retained in that condition.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan LPB, SP1T, SP2T, 1T, 2T, 3T and 4T.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons

3. The proposed extension to the property would bring the terrace of housing closer to the adjoining property of 80 Princes Road at ground and first floors. There would be a gap retained to the boundary at first floor, which would increase towards the rear of the appeal property. The existing large ground floor extension to No. 80 means the proposed first floor extension to No. 82 would be most appreciable only from the first floor rear windows to No. 80.

4. From having regard to the submitted drawings and observations at the site visit it is apparent that the step-in of the proposed extension at first floor would be sufficient to ensure the outlook of the adjoining property is not adversely affected. This would further mean that the depth of the extension at first floor would not impact upon the outlook from the neighbouring house. For similar reasons I consider that, on the basis of the information before me, there would not be any material effect on the levels of light received to the first floor windows of the adjoining house.
5. In coming to the above conclusions I have had regard to the rearward projection of the other property to the east of No. 80. I consider the outlook and levels of light to No. 80 would still be of sufficient quality even having regard to that projection. The fact that No. 80, and the rest of the adjoining housing, faces south assists in providing a good degree of outlook and natural light. I further note that no objection has been raised to the proposed extension by the occupiers of the neighbouring houses.
6. There is a difference in floor levels between the appeal property and No. 80, with the result that steps down to the garden are necessary from the proposed ground floor extension at the rear. This leads to a raised rear living area compared to the garden of No. 80. The submitted drawings show a privacy screen alongside these steps, which I judge sufficient to ensure there would not be an unreasonable degree of overlooking to the neighbour.
7. On the main issue it is considered that the submitted drawings and observations at the site visit lead to the conclusion that the design, scale and siting of the proposed extension would not be harmful to the living conditions of the adjoining occupiers. Thus, the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policy DBE9 of the adopted Epping Forest District Local Plan 1998, which requires new development to not result in excessive loss of amenity for neighbouring properties, and with the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.
8. The design and scale of the proposed extension would relate well to the host property and to the wider area, and so retain the character and appearance of the terrace and the street.

Conclusion and conditions

9. Planning permission is therefore granted. I have attached the Council's suggested condition requiring matching materials, to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the proposed extension. A condition is necessary to ensure provision and retention of the privacy screen shown on the drawings, to ensure no overlooking to the adjoining property. I have also attached a condition specifying the approved drawings since it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

C Leigh

INSPECTOR