



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by Chris Couper BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3271452

31 Westrow Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford 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 Gurdip Singh Sangha against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4244/20, dated 11 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 31 Westrow Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9NE in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 4244/20, dated 11 December 2020, 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: PP/01, PP/02, PP/03 and PP/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area overwhelmingly comprises bungalows which were laid out in the 1920's and 1930's on large plots, in a spacious pattern, with a regular set back from the roads, and with vernacular detailing. As evidenced by the photographs at paragraphs 6.29 to 6.31 of the appellant's statement, many have been significantly extended, such that they are now fairly substantial properties. That said, although some have first floor accommodation, viewed from the road they generally retain their low eaves height and a single storey form.

4. In that context, whilst 31 Westrow Gardens ('No 31') is set back from the adjacent roads on a generous corner plot, the building's two storey bulk, which includes an existing first floor extension on its northern flank, does not reflect the area's prevailing character.
5. The proposal would involve an extension above a rather functional and crude flat-roofed projection on the host's southern flank. Its form, style, and hipped roof would broadly mirror the extension on No 31's other side, and the resultant building would thus have an improved, more balanced appearance at this prominent spot in the Westrow Gardens streetscene.
6. Whilst the scheme would increase No 31's bulk, its footprint would not be any greater, and it would not extend any closer to the adjacent highways than the existing building. It would still be set back around 3 metres from Trenance Gardens. Consequently, although the extension would be stepped forward of that road's prevailing building line, given the existing scale of No 31, the spacious corner plot, the proposed matching materials, and the distance to the nearest bungalows, the resultant development would not appear significantly more conspicuous in that streetscene.
7. Additionally, as illustrated at paragraph 6.21 of the appellant's statement, No 31's profile would not significantly change when viewed from the south. Furthermore, as the nearby properties to the north along this stretch of Westrow Gardens have substantial two storey rear projections, the resultant building would not appear out of place looking along their rear faces.
8. Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) ('RLP') promotes high quality design which respects local character, and which makes a positive contribution to its context. Along with RLP Policy LP33, it seeks to complement the borough's heritage assets, with the latter policy also reflecting the statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
9. For the above reasons, the character and appearance of The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area would be preserved, and the scheme would not conflict with those policies, or with that statutory test.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Turning to the matter of conditions, I have imposed the standard time limit condition and, in the interests of certainty, a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
11. Additionally, in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the area, a condition is necessary requiring that the development be faced with matching materials.
12. For the above reasons, and irrespective of the appellant's personal circumstances, I conclude that the scheme would not harm the character and appearance of The Bungalows Estate Conservation Area. Consequently, having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

Chris Couper

INSPECTOR