



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3280586

35 Gyllyngdune Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9HJ

- 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 M Sharif against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2230/21, dated 25 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is for a loft conversion with front and rear dormers, front bay structure and rear detached games room structure.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear detached games room structure. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front bay structure, and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front bay structure at 35 Gyllyngdune Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9HJ in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: 2230/21 dated 25 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: site location plan, 6837/3A, 6637/10
 - 3) The external finishes of the development hereby permitted shall match in material and colour those of the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. For the reasons that follow, I find the proposed loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front bay structure to be acceptable and they are clearly severable both physically and functionally from the proposed detached games room. Therefore I intend to issue a split decision in this case and grant planning permission for the loft conversion, dormers and bay.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of each element of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the dwelling and The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

Front bay and loft conversion with front and rear dormers

4. The appeal site comprises a modest semi-detached bungalow of traditional, inter-war design, separated from the street by a low brick wall. There is a driveway to one side of the main dwelling. The bungalow has a characteristic front bay with gable above, recessed front door and open porch.
5. The site lies within the CA, whose character is derived from suburban bungalows of similar scale and design. Although some dwellings are detached and many have undergone extension and alteration, there remains a high degree of uniformity in the area in terms of scale and layout.
6. Nevertheless, the CA Character Appraisal notes a number of design features, hence the variety of detailing to be seen. Such elements include front bays, which have been used time and time again; one large (drawing room) and one smaller bay (bedroom) with gables over each side of the front entrance.
7. The appeal proposal incorporates an additional front bay to the bedroom. It would be smaller than the existing drawing room bay, and of a similar design. To my mind, the feature would reflect the architectural detailing identified in the Character Appraisal. It would be modest in scale and its overall appearance would be in keeping with host bungalow and those around it.
8. I note that the Council does not object to the front and rear dormers and I have no reason to disagree. The scale, size and the number of dormers would not represent dominant features within the roof slopes, and would not detract from the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding area.
9. I am therefore of the view that the front bay and loft conversion with front and rear dormers would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the CA. It would accord with policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP), which seek to promote high quality design and protect the borough's heritage assets.

Rear detached games room

10. The CA Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) is clear that large garden buildings are not part of the traditional character of the CA. The SPD stipulates that outbuildings should generally have a cumulative floor area of 25% of the floor area of the original property.
11. The Council indicates that the games room would have a floor area of over 50% of the floor area of the original property. This figure does not appear to be disputed by the appellant. In addition to the excessive floor area that would be out of scale to the plot and the house it would serve, the boxy design of the games room would be visually intrusive within the rear garden setting. I am aware of other outbuildings in adjacent rear gardens, however I have no information before me to indicate how these structures came to be in place.
12. I consider that the games room would result in harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the CA. It would fail to meet policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP), which seek to promote high quality design and protect the borough's heritage assets.

Conditions

13. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of planning permission I have specified a condition which ties the scheme to the approved plans in the interests of proper planning. Additionally materials are required to match the existing building in order to ensure that the external appearance of the proposal is satisfactory.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front bay structure, but dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear detached games room structure.

C Hall

INSPECTOR