

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2016

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 01 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3158535

11 Egerton Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 9HP

- 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 Kishore Marwaha against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 1035/16, dated 4 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is garage conversion to habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The existing garage is a sectional concrete structure in the rear garden of the appeal property. Notwithstanding the description of the development given in the summary above, taken from the planning application form, the proposal involves removing this building and replacing it with a new, enlarged structure. This would contain a fitness area, sauna and shower.
 4. The Bungalow Estate [formerly Mayfield] Conservation Area was developed in the 1920s & 1930s as an extensive area of bungalows, laid out in straight rows, well set back on a rectangular street plan. Plots are quite wide and in places, including Egerton Gardens, rear gardens are long, creating a low density layout with large areas of open gardens secluded from the roads. The bungalows are both detached and semi-detached, with much subtle variety of detailed design contained within a standard dual pitched roof form, the ridge typically parallel to the road. In many cases, views into the rear gardens are blocked by high gates, the erection of attached garages or the presence of outbuildings behind the dwellings. Mature trees can nonetheless often be glimpsed beyond these, while a range of rear extensions can be seen behind corner plots.
 5. The estate is an important heritage asset, apparently one of the largest bungalow developments in London, the value and distinctiveness of which
-

would seem to arise mainly from the overall layout and assemblage rather than from the presence of individually distinguished buildings. Many 'modernising' influences are evident, and cumulatively they can significantly prejudice the heritage integrity of the area.

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow. At the rear, a ground floor extension and a full width box dormer considerably enlarge the scale of the building. The existing garage is of more recent 20th century origin, possibly built before an Article 4 Direction withdrew permitted development rights to erect such structures. The front has a modern up-and-over type door, which is clearly visible from the road, and it stands next to a similar and equally incongruous garage behind no.13. The replacement building would be re-sited 1 metre from the boundary. This means that a smaller amount of the end elevation would be visible in the street scene. It would continue to have a flat roof, but a rendered wall with a small window would replace the existing garage door. I consider that this change in siting and elevation, while not great, would improve the impact of the building on the street scene to a limited extent.
7. Against this positive effect should be set the increased width and greater footprint of the new building. It would not become a dominant feature in the rear garden, which is predominantly open and very extensive, widening out behind adjoining plots. However, the use of a very utilitarian design, with no concessions to the qualities of the conservation area, would perpetuate an unsatisfactory appearance for a building that would remain a negative feature in the street scene. I consider that this would exacerbate a number of unsympathetic changes that have already been made to the property, including the use of modern materials and covering the front garden with a paved area. Foregoing the opportunity to improve on the appearance of the building and the site in such an emphatic way would tilt the balance of impact from neutral to negative, bearing in mind the importance of high quality design as a component of sustainable development. Overall, the proposal would detract from the distinctive heritage qualities of the conservation area that underpin its historical and architectural interest.
8. Consequently I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. It would not satisfy the statutory duty in this respect. There would be conflict with Strategic Policy 3 in the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy (2008) and with Policies BD1 & E3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies (2008). Among other things, these policies seek to encourage a high standard of design, contribute to the distinctive character of an area and conserve the built heritage. The proposal also falls short in relation to Council Supplementary Planning Guidance, *Preservation and Enhancement Scheme for Mayfield Conservation Area* (2004), which seeks to counter changes in character and appearance that harm the area's qualities.
9. Planning permission should therefore be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR