



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2022

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3301658

14 Budoch Drive, Seven Kings, Redbridge, Ilford, IG3 9NX

- 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 R Gadhvi against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 1350/22 dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing garage. Single storey side extension to create garage/store. Single storey rear conservatory extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for (to) demolish existing garage. Single storey side extension to create garage/store. Single storey rear conservatory extension at 14 Budoch Drive, Seven Kings, Redbridge, Ilford, IG3 9NX in accordance with the terms of the application ref: 1350/22 dated 19 April 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date of this decision;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in complete accordance with the following approved plans: location plan (dated Tuesday, April 19, 2022, ID: CM-01032903) and proposed plans, drawing ref: 7073/2;
 - 3) The materials used in development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling unless details are submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the setting of the bungalow and quality and historic value of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property located within the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (CA). The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990, S72, states that with respect to any buildings or other land in a CA, special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or

enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The proposal would replace the existing detached side garage, would be 2.5m in width, 3m in height and would have an overall projection of 11.11m beyond the original rear wall of the main dwelling. The proposed rear conservatory would be an addition to an existing rear extension which would serve as a joint structure between the existing rear extension and the proposed side/rear extension. The proposed conservatory would be a shallow pitch roof structure with a depth of 3m and a height of 2.35m at eaves and 3m at the highest point.

5. It is clear from the plans, and my site visit, that whilst the proposed projection of 11.11m beyond the original rear wall of the main dwelling is noted there is an existing garage in place. I do not find that the proposal would result in built form projecting further past the original rear wall of the main dwelling than is already the case with the existing garage. The side extension element would still be significantly set back from the front elevation, in line with the existing garage of the adjoining property, with a small increase in width to the property boundary. There would be a very modest increase in built form/footprint as a result of this element. I do not find this element would undermine the surrounds of the appeal site given the overall plot size and existing built form.
6. The conservatory would be attached to an existing rear extension and result in a wraparound extension overall, however, the scale of the conservatory would be modest. Due to the existing garage and overall proposal design, I do not find it would result in an incongruous addition with excessive depth albeit I do note the previous extension. Broadly speaking, rear extensions, as result of their location, are in less prominent locations and therefore can generally result in less impact upon the significance of the character of the CA.
7. The proposal is noted by the Council to mimic some of the designs of properties nearby which already have existing wrap-around or joint extensions so acknowledge that such proposals are characteristic for the area albeit I suspect some were approved prior to the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide 2018 (the Design Guide). I do not, however, have any evidence before me within this appeal as to the claimed proliferation of such extensions leading to a cumulative erosion which would justify refusal of the proposal before me as a result of erosion of characteristic spacious plots.
8. I would consider the front elevation and its setting to be particularly sensitive in terms of a CA when viewed from the street scene. The Council state that the proposal would undermine the detached and spacious nature of the surrounds of the bungalow; however, I find the proposal would have the same visual impact when viewed from the street scene as the existing front elevation. A modest increase in width to the boundary, and movement forward by around two metres, compared to the existing garage structure would not in this case undermine the detached nature or surrounds of the bungalow.
9. The appeal site and neighbouring property are clearly detached with substantial frontages in the form of a driveway and sideway before the proposal's built form would commence. The Council's refusal reason references existing structures within adjacent properties; however, no commentary or analysis has been provided to accompany this or provide explanation as to its inclusion.
10. The Council's delegated report makes reference to recommendations within the Design Guide, which is stated, by the Council, to state that rear extensions should not exceed half the depth of the dwelling and that any wrap around

structures should be avoided. This Design Guide is also noted as being referred to within objections. The appeal must be determined on the evidence before me and, despite reference to the Design Guide within the delegated report, the Council have not submitted a copy of this document as part of this appeal and, furthermore, have not referred to it as a basis within their final refusal reason.

11. Even if I had the Design Guide before me as evidence and it had been included in the refusal reason, I find that the proposal seeks to replace existing built form with a not disproportionate increase in volume and footprint with regard to the side/rear extension. The impact of this I have discussed above and the existing site circumstances, and replacement of built form, I find would justify a departure from the guidance with regard to that element. The addition of the conservatory, in these circumstances, would have minimal impact given it would be of limited visibility within the immediate area of the appeal site and the property would still benefit from a large spacious plot as demonstrated on the submitted block plan (unreferenced) at 1:500. Overall, I do not find that the proposal would result in cumulative harm to the quality or historic value of the CA or its objective to protect the detached and spacious nature of the surrounds of the bungalow at the appeal site.
12. The proposal would be consistent with Redbridge Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy LP26 which seeks to secure high quality design that respects the character of the area and LP Policy LP33 which seeks to ensure that the borough's heritage assets are conserved, protected and enhanced in an appropriate manner. The proposal would also be consistent with London Plan 2021 (LDN) Policy D3 which requires proposals to respect heritage assets that contribute towards local character and LDN Policy HC1 which requires proposals to be sympathetic to the asset's significance and appreciation of their surroundings.

Other Matters

13. I note objections to the proposal that relate to overdevelopment, overall scale/size and design and previous extension. I have dealt with these matters within the main body of this decision letter above.

Conditions

14. The Council have suggested three standard conditions which I have applied. A time condition is attached to comply with section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent. A materials condition is required to ensure the proposal matches the host dwelling and that any deviations in materials from existing are approved by the Council to ensure an appropriate finish.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR