



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 April 2021

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3263331

84 Breamore Road, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9NJ

- 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 Dr Leela Knight against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 2761/20, dated 1 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The proposed development is for a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The impact of the proposals upon the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.
 - The impact of the proposals upon the living conditions of neighbours

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi detached dormer bungalow within the designated Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. The property fronts onto Breamore Road with an open aspect and vehicle hardstanding to the front and garden and detached garage to the rear. The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area is significant due to its consistent and uniform design of speculative bungalows sitting within their own large landscaped plots as laid out in the early 20th Century.
4. The estate itself dates from the 1920's and 1930's and exemplifies early suburban development of this time where the houses sport Arts and Crafts style architectural features such as bow windows, Mock Tudor gables and modest pitched roof dormers. In plan form most of the properties are generally semi detached and tend to sit comfortably within good sized garden plots.
5. The appeal property is one such semi detached bungalow with two asymmetrical gables flanking a central glass porch. To the rear of the property

there is an existing rear flat roof extension that contains a kitchen/dining room and ground floor WC and utility room as well as a detached garage. The rear garden appears to be more modest than many in the conservation area and is generally laid to lawn with decking nearest to the house and a fence to the boundaries of the plot. There is also currently a small garden shed sited on approximately the same plot as where the proposed extension is intended to be located.

6. Adjoining the property, the neighbouring bungalow also has a similar ground floor flat roof rear extension extending to the same depth as that as currently exists on the appeal property.
7. The proposal before me would see a new extension of this single storey flat roof element to be built upon the common boundary in order to create a new ground floor bedroom fronting the garden. The new extension would extend by around 4 metres at the same height as that of the existing rear extension at around 3.2 metres high.

Effect Upon the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

8. In considering this appeal I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that 'Special Attention' to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is reflected in paragraph 192 of The Framework, which illustrates the positive contribution that heritage assets can make to the creation of sustainable and economically viable communities.
9. Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 as well as the adopted Bungalow Estate Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (BESPD)¹ also reflect The Framework in the fact that they require proposals to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate due to its historic and architectural significance.
10. I consider that part of the significance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area is due to properties being situated in relatively generous gardens, especially to the rear. Although an amount of garden area would remain, in this case I consider that there will be some harm to the conservation area through yet a further encroachment into the rear open space and a further reduction in the garden area associated with the existing bungalow.
11. The impact of the development would therefore result in a further extension of built development to this plot that would exceed 50% of the depth of the original house. I consider therefore that a further extension would be contrary to the special historic and architectural character of the conservation area and would also be contrary to the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide.
12. In finding harm to the historic environment, I have considered the potential for public benefits that may be obtained through this scheme. Although I recognise the benefits of creating another bedroom in the property for a carer, as outlined by the appellant, I consider this as more of a private benefit. In assessing the public benefits therefore I do not consider that they are

¹ Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted June 2018.

extensive enough to outweigh the harm that I have identified to the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

13. As such the proposals fail to meet the requirements contained within the Framework or the Local Plan policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan and the Bungalow Estate Design Guide SPD that seek to preserve or enhance the historic environment.

Effect Upon the Living Conditions of Neighbours

14. The proposal would see the extension increase the built development very near to the common boundary with the adjoining neighbour. As mentioned above, I saw on my site visit that this neighbour has an existing window close to this shared boundary. Although the existing fence and garden shed already enclose this boundary to some extent, I consider that the introduction of a more solid and taller physical extension would have an effect of being over dominant upon the living conditions of the neighbour when using this room.
15. Moreover, I consider that, due to the orientation of the two properties, that is likely that there will be some over shadowing of the neighbouring property as a direct result of the proposed extension. In light of this I consider that the policy requirements contained within Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan have not been met and that the living conditions of neighbours will be adversely affected through this proposal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR