



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/21/3285381

31 Westrow Gardens, 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 3069/21, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2021.
 - The proposed development is a single storey detached garage/recreation room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area, (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 1 Trenance Gardens and (c) parking and highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies on the corner of Westrow Gardens and Trenance Gardens within the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. The street scene is characterised by bungalows of similar age and style, typically with distinctive bay windows with projecting gable feature above under steeply pitched roofs. In contrast, the dwelling on the appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling which, at the time of my site visit, was being extended. It has a wide frontage onto Westrow Gardens with paved frontage and in / out access.
4. 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.
5. The proposed outbuilding, which would provide a garage and recreation area, would be located within the rear garden of the property, the side boundary of which fronts Trenance Gardens. It would be some 11 metres in length occupying about two-thirds of the width of the garden and sited right up to the rear boundary which adjoins 1 Trenance Gardens. A new access and drive is indicated to be provided off Trenance Gardens adjoining the existing access and driveway serving this adjoining property.

Character and appearance

6. The proposed outbuilding would be set back from the Trenance Gardens frontage by the new proposed driveway area. However, whilst it would be flat roofed, at some 5 metres in width and 11 metres length, it would constitute a large building which would occupy a significant proportion of the rear garden area. It would be visible through the proposed new access and, in addition, at 3 metres height it would be visible above the existing fence along the Trenance Gardens frontage.
7. I have been referred to both the Council's Housing Design SPD (2019) and the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide (2018) (DG). These documents seek to ensure that outbuildings do not impact on the open character of the garden or surrounding area, are of a scale that has regard to the prevailing character of outbuildings in the locality and specifically the DG notes that "*large garden buildings are not part of the traditional character of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area*".
8. Whilst flat roofed garages are to be found in the immediate locality, and indeed there is one in the rear garden of No. 33 Westrow Gardens, immediately opposite the site, they appear to be of relatively modest proportions and clearly subservient in size and scale to the host dwelling. The appellant clarifies that the garage is required to provide a secure parking space for a classic car that is currently parked on the front drive of the property. However, whilst noting the typical size of a modern garage, it seems to me that the proposed outbuilding would be of unduly large scale. For these reasons, it would fail to be subservient to the host dwelling and would appear as a dominant building within the conservation area.
9. I therefore find that the proposed outbuilding would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (RLP) 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. For the above reasons it would also not satisfy the guidance in the SPD and DG.
10. There would also be conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP), to which I have been referred, which seeks to ensure that development conserves the significance of heritage assets.

Living conditions

11. The adjoining property to the rear, No. 1 Trenance Gardens, is a semi-detached bungalow, typical of the predominant character of the area. It has a number of windows in the flank elevation facing the appeal site, some of which appeared to serve habitable rooms. The driveway serving a garage located to the rear of the dwelling adjoins this flank elevation which is set back around 2.5metres from the boundary with the appeal site.
12. Whilst the rear elevation of the proposed outbuilding would be sited directly opposite this flank elevation, the separation afforded by the driveway would in my view ensure that there would be no unacceptable impact on the light and

outlook currently enjoyed by these affected windows. The additional height of the proposed outbuilding that would be visible above the fence would in my view have a limited impact.

13. I therefore find that the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property would not be unacceptably harmed and there would therefore be no conflict with RLP policies LP26 and LP30 which seek to avoid adverse impacts on outlook and the sunlight / daylight received by neighbouring properties.

Parking and highway safety

14. The proposed access onto Trenance Gardens would result in the loss of an on street parking space and would also be sited quite close to the existing access at the adjoining property, No. 1 Trenance Gardens. However, I see no reason why this should be an inherently dangerous situation and I note that a number of similar arrangements exist nearby. The existing garden fence could obstruct visibility but a condition could be imposed to require the nearest sections of the fence to be removed or altered to ensure that suitable visibility splays could be provided. There appeared to be reasonable opportunities for on street parking within the immediate area such that the loss of this one space would not have a significant impact.
15. The proposal would also result in the creation of further parking spaces at the property, notwithstanding that there are already a number within the front garden. Whilst the relevant standard appears to operate as a maximum, it is clear that the existing arrangement already provides for more than this and in my view, the provision of a further space within the proposed garage would not significantly alter this situation, particularly, as noted above, it is required to provide secure parking for one of the Appellant's existing cars.
16. In these circumstances, I do not consider that any harm would arise either in regard to the additional parking provision or to highway safety and the proposal would therefore comply with RLP policies LP22 and LP23 and LP policies T2 and T6 which seek to maintain highway safety and minimise the use of the private motor car.

Conclusions

17. I therefore conclude that, whilst there would be no unacceptable impact arising in respect of parking, highway safety or the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, the harm arising to the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area is such as to render the development unacceptable and in conflict with the development plan overall.
18. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework, I do not find that the harm arising to the significance of the heritage asset is outweighed by any public benefits. In my view, material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan.
19. Therefore this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR