



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: 25th April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3284848

71 Levett Gardens, Ilford IG3 9BU

- 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 Amjad Hussain against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2201/21, dated 3 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2021.
 - The development is single storey side extension and conversion of garage to habitable room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The dwelling on the appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow. The front and side elevations appear to be largely in their original form with projecting bay windows to the front with large gable features above and side entrance, reflecting the other half of the semi-detached pair. The dwelling is set back from the road frontage, which is marked by a low brick wall, behind a paved area to the front and side leading to a single garage located just behind the dwelling. The dwelling has also been extended to the rear with a single storey addition, attached to the garage.
4. Levett Gardens and the wider conservation area is characterised predominantly by bungalows of similar age and style, typically with distinctive bay windows with projecting gable feature above under 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 generally set within tree lined streets with generous back gardens.

Character and appearance

5. The proposed side extension would 'fill the gap' to the side boundary with the adjoining property which has a similar layout with gap to the side of the dwelling and garage to the rear which forms a semi-detached pair with the garage on the appeal site. The Council's Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide (2018) (DG) states that the spacing between buildings and views

within the gaps help to define the character of the conservation area. It states, amongst other things, that side extensions should be set a minimum of one metre from any side boundary, set back one metre from the front elevation, with a ridge height a minimum of three metres below that of the original roof line; linked side / rear extensions are also not supported.

6. The position of the garage at the appeal site means that there is not a continuous open view to the rear along this side boundary. Nevertheless, it is set well back into the site, just to the rear of the original, main part of the dwelling such that the open space to the side of the dwelling contributes to the character of the area as identified in the DG.
7. The proposed extension would generally maintain a subservient appearance being 2.5 metres below the ridge height of the host dwelling with a set back in accordance with the DG. However, in extending right up to the side boundary, it would significantly reduce the gap and impinge on the space that currently exists between the two properties. In addition, it would necessitate the relocation of the entrance door to the front elevation, at odds with the other half of the semi-detached pair.
8. I therefore find that the proposed extension would detract from the appearance of the host dwelling and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the wider Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. The proposal would thereby conflict 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.
9. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties nearby where there are either garages to the side of dwellings or single storey extensions up to the side boundary, in some cases in line with the front elevation of the dwelling. In the case of garages, these appeared to be part of the original planned layout, as they are set out in semi-detached pairs and provide a balance between adjacent properties. In other instances, the circumstances under which such additions were built are unclear and I note that the Council's DG, which seeks to restrict extensions that further dilute the character of the conservation area, has been only relatively recently adopted. In addition, I do not consider that these existing additions are such as to have resulted in a complete change to the spatial character and layout of the original within the context of the appeal site.

Conclusions

10. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR