



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 June 2019

by Adrian Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3225165

10 Westrow Gardens, Ilford, Essex IG3 9NE

- 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 Saribjit Dhothar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The undated application Ref 2223/18, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension to ground floor bedrooms and replacement of front garage shutter to a window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The submitted plans appear to contain a number of inaccuracies. For example, from my observations, the existing ground floor bedroom extension to the rear of 10 Westrow Gardens does not project beyond the rest of the rear elevation as it is shown to do so on almost all the existing and proposed plans. The proposed plans also show inconsistencies in the extent of the proposed single storey rear extension. In addition, the proposed change from the garage shutter to a window, as per the description of development, is not reflected on the proposed floor plan. I have given the appellant ample opportunity to comment on these matters. However, no comments have been received.
3. It is imperative that plans are accurate to avoid uncertainty about what is proposed. Irrespective of my views on the planning merits of the proposal, the fact is that these inaccuracies create substantial doubt as to its overall size and appearance. Moreover, they raise serious doubt as to whether the proposal could even be implemented. These matters are highly undesirable in general terms, but especially so given that No 10 lies within the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (BECA).
4. Consequently, I am not able to properly assess whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BECA, as required by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Nor could I reasonably draw any conclusions against the relevant policies or advice of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Redbridge Local Plan 2018, and the BECA Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018.

5. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Adrian Caines

INSPECTOR