



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3317201

31 Westrow Gardens, Seven Kings, Redbridge 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 3316/22 dated 03 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 06 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed single storey garage/recreation room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The site is a detached two storey property on the corner of Westrow Gardens and Trenance Gardens within a predominantly residential area. The proposed development would be located to the rear of the site and provide a garage and recreation area. A new access would be provided from Trenance Gardens.
4. The appeal site is within the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
5. The Conservation Area in the vicinity of the appeal site is characterised by detached and semi-detached bungalows. The appeal site is a two storey property which has been extended.
6. The Bungalow Estate Conservation Design Guide (2018) (the Design Guide) highlights that the compact scale and spatial planning of the bungalows with their low horizons and views through to their garden settings is a fundamental aspect of the character of the conservation area.
7. The Design Guide seeks to ensure outbuildings do not effect the open character of a garden or surrounding area, and are of a scale that has regard to the prevailing character of outbuildings in the locality. The Design Guide highlights

that large garden buildings are not part of the traditional character of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.

8. The proposed development at the scale proposed would be a large outbuilding. Whilst set back from the highway and despite proposing a flat roof due to the size and scale of the building in a prominent location the development would appear incongruous to the area. The proposed development would restrict the existing open aspect viewed from Trenance Gardens to the rear gardens of the appeal site and adjacent properties.
9. I observed during my site visit that there are other detached garages in the immediate area, however these tend to be subservient in scale. I understand that the proposed development has been reduced in size from that proposed in an application which was previously refused and dismissed at appeal¹. Notwithstanding this the scale proposed would be a dominant and unsympathetic feature in the area.
10. Whilst the appeal property is different to the prevailing type and design of properties in the area, the proposed development would be viewed in the context of the wider streetscene. I find that the proposed development would lead to harm of a designated heritage asset.
11. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification based on Framework paragraph 200.
12. I find that the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm of the significance of the Conservation Area. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. I find that there are no public benefits which would outweigh the harm caused by the proposed development.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. There is conflict with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to ensure developments are of high quality, is subordinate to the existing dwelling and preserves the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal reference: APP/W5780/D/21/3285381