



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 December 2019

by Stephen Wilkinson BA BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/19/3239552

30 Westrow Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 9NF

- 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 and Mrs Channa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2393/19, dated 3 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a front porch and the addition of roof lights to the existing rear extension, front roof, rear roof with minor internal changes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to the proposed porch and front rooflight and allowed in so far as it relates to the proposed rear roof lights subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to rooflights on the rear elevations: Block Plan Sheet 10 Revision A; Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan Sheet 1 Revision A; Existing and proposed front elevation Sheet 2 Revision A; Existing and Proposed Roof Plan Sheet 3 Revision A; Existing and proposed front elevation Sheet No 4 Revision A; Existing and Proposed Rear Elevation Sheet 5 Revision A; Existing and Proposed south elevation Sheet 6 Revision A; Existing and Proposed North Elevation Sheet 7 Revision A; Existing and Proposed Section A Sheet 8 Revision A; Location Plan Sheet 9 Revision A.
 - 3) Notwithstanding the submitted details, that part of the development hereby permitted, shall be completed in materials, the details of which shall have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area ('the CA').

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a chalet bungalow characteristic of properties of the CA. This has an overwhelming feeling of openness determined by detached bungalows set back from road frontages along a series of broad avenues. Individually many properties still retain their original features such as gabled bays and dormers and recessed entrances; these are features covered by an Article 4 Direction.
4. The proposals includes 6 roof lights, 5 to the rear with one to the front roof plane. Those to the rear are acceptable, forming part of extensions to the original property and would not detract from the character or appearance of the appeal site and in turn the CA. However, the one to the front plane although modest in size, would be visible from Westrow Gardens and would detract from the character and appearance of the property and in turn the CA.
5. Although the proposed porch is modest in scale it would introduce a new feature into the streetscene. The CA Guidelines seek to resist new porches given that a feature of the CA, is that new porches are recessed within buildings or on their side. The appellants use of materials to match the existing property would not overcome my concerns on this point. I acknowledge the appellants' concerns over the need to design out crime given the recent spate of burglaries. However, I consider that there are other ways of addressing these concerns.
6. The appellants identify a range of factors which they consider are key elements to the CA which would not be affected by this proposal including highway alignment, imposing built form and thoroughfares and typography and landscape features. I would add that a critical feature is the scale and design of the individual buildings within the CA which together are an essential feature which define its character and this would be adversely affected. It is for these reasons that the Council has designated the CA as an Article 4 area. Although there are other porches on the estate, I am unsure of their planning history and whether they preceded the designation of the Article 4 direction.
7. Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) seek to promote high quality design and to ensure that householder extensions complement the character of the original building. Policy LP33 seeks to resist development that does not preserve or enhance the character of designated heritage assets or where it would result in harm. I conclude that the proposed rear roof lights would not adversely impact on the character or appearance of the CA but the proposed front roof light and porch would conflict with these adopted policies.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard condition which limits the life of the permission I have specified the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of the proper planning of the area. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the roof lights would preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusions

9. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I hereby dismiss that part of the appeal insofar as it relates to the front roof light and the porch and allow that part of the appeal insofar as it relates to the 5 roof lights to the rear of the property.

Stephen Wilkinson

INSPECTOR