



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3280769

14 Tresco Gardens, Ilford IG3 9NH

- 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 Sajahan Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2127/21, dated 26 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a side double and 6 metre rear extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The Council describes the proposal as "single and part first floor rear extension; single and part first floor side extension". This more accurately describes the proposal though I note that it also includes the conversion of the existing garage.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single and part first floor rear extension; single and part first floor side extension at 14 Tresco Gardens, Ilford IG3 9NH, in accordance with the terms of application ref. 2127/21 dated 26 January 2021 and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) 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.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: TG.101.01.R1 (existing floor plans and elevations; 1:1250 site location map); TG.101.02 R1 (proposed floor plans and elevations); TG.101.04.R1 (existing and proposed roof plan); TG.101.03 (site block plan).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling on the appeal site is a two-storey property which appears to have been originally one half of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, but which are

now attached to another semi-detached pair, with which they form a row. The road is characterised by similar semi-detached pairs, many of which have also been extended to the side by two-storey additions which 'join' the pairs. They are of distinctive style and appearance with square bay windows with gable projection at roof level with hipped tiled roofs. The windows designs are a particular feature of many of the properties with arched central segments and top lights in stained glass. The original dwellings, such as that on the appeal site, also have distinctive rear angled bay windows.

5. The wider conservation area is characterised predominantly by bungalows of similar age and style, also with distinctive bay windows with projecting gable feature above and steeply pitched roofs. The description attached to the conservation area map describes it as an extensive estate laid out in the 1920s and 1930s in a regular street plan with set-back building line giving a relaxed air to the street scene. The properties are set within tree lined streets with generous back gardens.
6. The proposal involves a first floor over the existing attached garage, which is to be converted to a living room, which wraps around the rear of the dwelling with single and two storey elements. The two-storey element would have a hipped roof to match the existing dwelling with the rear single storey element having a flat roof.
7. The first-floor element above the garage would be set back from the main front elevation of the host property and would be sited right up to the boundary, thus 'filling the gap' at this level. The current gap, together with the similar gap above the garage of the adjoining property, no. 12, provides a view of mature trees in the garden areas beyond. The proposal would reduce this gap albeit a narrower gap and view of the trees would remain.
8. The Council suggests that the prevailing pattern in the locality is one that maintains such 'air gaps' between properties. However, that is not the case within the immediate street scene within which the appeal site is located where, in my assessment, the majority of properties have been extended to the side such that the resulting continuous built form has now become part of the established character. A small gap would remain at ground floor level between the adjoining garages with the first floor above the adjoining property also remaining open. In addition, I consider that the set back of the proposed first floor would maintain the integrity of the original retained front projecting gable feature.
9. With regard to the rear extension, I note that the single-storey flat-roofed element of this would have a depth of 4 metres. In my view this would not be disproportionate in depth or scale bearing in mind the proportions of the host dwelling. The loss of the existing rear ground floor bay window would be unfortunate as it appears to be an original feature. However, it is not visible within the street scene and the first floor bay window would be retained.
10. The Appellant has also drawn my attention to two properties within the street where similar first floor side and rear extensions have been recently permitted. These involved the loss of side 'air gaps' and the rear bay windows.
11. In all the above circumstances I do not find that the proposal would be incongruous. I therefore find that the proposed extensions would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider

Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. The proposal would accord with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) which seek high quality design that respects local character and is well integrated with the local area, complements the character of and is subordinate to the existing dwelling and preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area.

12. Conditions to ensure that matching materials are used in the interests of visual amenity and to refer to the approved plans in the interests of proper planning are necessary.

Conclusions

13. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR