

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2016

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3160427

3B Forterie Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 9BY

- 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 Mohammed Rafique against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3391/16, dated 14 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council has treated this proposal as if it is in the Bungalows Estate Conservation Area. Close inspection of the conservation area map shows that the boundary of the area runs through the appeal site, and that the proposed side extension would be erected outside the boundary. The Council has since confirmed that the boundary is shown correctly. I have considered the appeal accordingly.
3. After this proposal was refused planning permission by the local planning authority, the appellant resubmitted an amended scheme that was intended to address the Council's reason for refusal. That scheme is the subject of a separate decision, ref APP/W5780/D/16/3163471.

Main Issues

4. I consider that these are the effects of the proposal on firstly, the character and appearance of the building and the area; and secondly, the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties in Dawlish Drive with respect to harm to outlook.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a compact, double-fronted detached bungalow. It was built on an infill plot south of a pair of semi-detached bungalows at no.s 1 & 3 Forterie Gardens. There is an existing side element, towards the next door
-

bungalow, used as a dining room. The proposed extension would be on the other side of the building, abutting the common boundary along the rear of no.s 205 & 207 Dawlish Drive.

First main issue – effect on character and appearance

6. The bungalow has a central front door with a larger and a smaller gable-topped bay feature to either side. In this respect, and with the lower original side element, the design appears consciously to reflect some of the distinctive design motifs that characterise many of the bungalows in the adjoining conservation area.
7. The proposed extension would be “in line”, continuing the front and rear elevations across to a new gable end with the same roof form and height as existing. I consider that that the height and bulk of the extension would unbalance and detract from the careful design of the front of the property. Although the front wall of the existing side element is also in line, the eaves and particularly the ridge are lower than the main part of the building. This gives the side element a distinctly subservient size and appearance that would not be reflected in the new addition. Moreover, the new ground floor window would be placed towards the outer corner of the building rather than, as might be expected, more centrally in the space between the bay window and the side wall. This matter might be addressed by a planning condition, but the basic form and scale of the extension is integral to what is being proposed.
8. Looking south towards the edge of the conservation area, the forms and design of the property reflects the rhythm of the bay window features of the adjoining bungalows. The divergence of the proposal from normative forms in the conservation area could just be seen from within the Area, looking outwards, but would be largely shielded from views looking in by a detached garage at the rear of no.205 Dawlish Drive. The proposal would have no effect on the integrity of the conservation area itself, and would not have a materially adverse effect on its setting. There is no need to satisfy conservation area design guidelines, as sought by some residents. Nonetheless, I consider that the short comings of the design would detract from the quality of the local street scene.
9. I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the building and the area. It would conflict with Policy SP3 in the Redbridge Core Strategy (2008) and Policy BD1 in the Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document (2008). Among other things, these policies seek a high quality in the built environment, in which all forms of development are compatible with the distinctive character of the area and contribute to local architecture and design quality.

Second main issue – effect on living conditions

10. The insertion of the appeal site into the prevailing layout of the area means that the rear gardens of adjoining properties in Dawlish Drive are shorter than elsewhere along that road. Despite this, the separation between the main rear elevations of these houses and the proposed new side wall of the appeal property would conform with typical distances at corner plots in the adjoining conservation area. I am not aware of any separation distance standards the

Council may have, but I consider that, in principle, the amount of separation would be reasonable and generally in keeping with the area.

11. In more detailed terms, no.205 Dawlish Drive (the corner house) has a first floor rear projection towards the appeal site. This abuts the back of the footway in Forterie Gardens. This means that the direct line of sight from the nearest rear upstairs window goes past the front elevation of no.3B and the other bungalows beyond it. At ground floor level, the detached garage abutting the appeal site would be the nearest building in the outlook from within no.205. The highest point of the extension would abut the boundary of no.207. Even here, I consider that outlook would remain reasonable from both ground and upper floor windows. Bringing the side wall of no.3B just over 2 metres closer to the adjoining houses would be unlikely to have a significant effect on outlook from either of these properties.
12. I conclude that the proposal would not detract materially from the living conditions of the occupiers of adjoining properties in Dawlish Drive with respect to loss of outlook. There would be no conflict with provisions in Policies SP3 & BD1 that require all new development to respect the amenity of adjoining properties and not to prejudice the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Overall conclusion

13. While I have found in favour of the proposal with respect to the second main issue, I consider that this is outweighed by the significant harm I have identified with regard to the character and appearance of the building and the locality.
14. Thus overall and on balance planning permission should be withheld, and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR