

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2017

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI MRSB

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

Decision date: 3 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/16/3162491

29 Brownlea Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 9NL

- 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 Narad Narinder against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2202/16, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front porch & proposed first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed porch and first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the street scene of Brownlea Gardens and on The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a modest semi-detached bungalow of traditional, inter-war design, set behind an open front garden separated from the street and No 31 by a low brick wall. There is a driveway to one side of the main dwelling leading to a single storey attached garage. The remaining front garden is mainly lawn with two small trees. The bungalow has two characteristic front bays with gables above and a small, central front dormer above the front door.
 4. The site lies within The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (CA) which is characterised by suburban inter-war bungalows of similar scale and design to the appeal dwelling. Although some bungalows are detached and many have undergone extension and alteration there remains a high degree of uniformity in the area in terms of scale, design and layout.
 5. The appeal dwelling, in common with others in the street, was built with a recessed front door and open porch. The recess has been enclosed by a second door which is flush with the front wall. The proposed porch would project forward of the front wall to just beyond the smaller front bay and just behind the larger bay. It would occupy almost all the space between the bays. Although
-

details of materials are not specified the porch appears from the submitted elevations to be a glazed structure. It would have a flat roof and double outward opening doors.

6. The scale and design of the proposed porch would detract from the characteristic appearance of the dwelling. It would be a prominent feature that would obscure the original central, arched, front door and porch and compete with the distinctive bays. The fully glazed design and the flat roof would be out of keeping with the design of the original dwelling and would add to the incongruous appearance of the porch.
7. Although I saw a small number of other porches in the street they were generally of more sympathetic design and in any case not so numerous as to be characteristic of the area. Overall the proposed porch, owing to its scale and design, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Bungalow Estate CA.
8. The appellant draws my attention to another appeal decision for a porch in a different part of the country. However, in that case the porch was found not to be prominent, nor to compete with the front bay window. It is not therefore readily comparable with the appeal proposal.
9. Turning to the first floor side extension, this would comprise a steeply pitched roof over the existing garage. It would be set back marginally from the main front elevation of the dwelling and set down from the main ridge. The roof pitch and eaves height would match those of the existing building. Overall, the design would be sympathetic to the original dwelling and similar to other side extensions in Brownlea Gardens and the surrounding streets.
10. It differs in that it would extend up to the shared boundary with the neighbouring bungalow at No 27. These dwellings are currently linked by their single storey garages and so, whilst there is no gap at ground level there is a significant gap between them at first floor. The proposed extension would fill about half of the gap. Whilst some openness would remain this would be insufficient to maintain the characteristic degree of separation seen elsewhere in the street. I accept that there are a small number of examples of gaps having been significantly reduced but these do not reflect the prevailing pattern of spaces between buildings, particularly above ground floor. Therefore, notwithstanding the set back and set down of the proposed roof, the noticeable reduction in the gap between No 29 and its neighbour, whilst avoiding the impression of terracing would nevertheless result in a cramped layout that would fail to reflect the established character of the area.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other side extensions in Brownlea Gardens and the surrounding streets. However, whilst a number of these are similar to the proposed extension in terms of scale and design, firstly, the Council explains that some of these were built prior to the conservation area designation being made in 1991 and I have no evidence to the contrary. Secondly, in most cases the remaining gap is more pronounced than would be the case at the appeal site.
12. It is therefore concluded on the main issue that the proposed porch and first floor side extension would have a materially detrimental effect on the character

and appearance of the street scene of Brownlea Gardens and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Bungalow Estate CA. In consequence they would conflict with Policy SP3 of the Core Strategy, 2008, with Policies BD1 and E3 of the Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document, 2008, and with guidance set out in the Mayfield Conservation Area design guide and the Householder Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, 2012 which, taken together, expect new development to be compatible with and contribute to the distinctive character of the area through appropriate style, massing, scale and design and in conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. They would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), particularly in respect of the effect on the CA, a designated Heritage Asset, to the conservation of which great weight is attached under paragraph 132 of the NPPF.

13. Finally, the appellant explains that the additional space and porch are needed to assist in providing care to his disabled Mother who uses a wheelchair and receives care from outside agencies who visit the house. Whilst I am sympathetic to the personal needs of the family and the appellant's desire to care for his mother at home this would not outweigh the harm identified above to the character and appearance of the area, particularly since the development would remain long after the personal needs of the family had ceased to apply.
14. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, including concerns raised by the appellant regarding the handling of the planning application and the representations of third parties, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR