



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2023

by J Symmons BSc (Hons) CEng MICE

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/23/3315380

463 - 489 High Road, Redbridge, Ilford IG1 1TX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Shahid Majeed of City Sports against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
- The application Ref 4819/18/04, dated 7 October 2022, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 7 of a planning permission Ref 4819/18, granted on 10 October 2019.
- The application was refused by notice dated 7 December 2022.
- The proposed development is *'The erection of 4 storey building to provide 25 (10 x one bedroom, 15 x two bedroom) units with associated car parking and landscaping, as approved by the Local Planning Authority under application 4819/18'*.
- The details for which approval is sought are: *'Document Reference 60.103, Drawing SP.100 'Site Plan', Drawing 00-100 'Proposed Ground Floor Plan' Revision F, Drawing 00-101 'Proposed First Floor Plan' Revision G, Drawing 00-102 'Proposed Second Floor Plan' Revision F, Drawing 00-103 'Proposed Third Floor Plan' Revision G, Drawing 00-104 'Proposed Fourth Floor Plan' Revision G and Drawing 00-105 'Proposed Roof Floor Plan' Revision G'.*

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and the application Ref 4819/18/04 details submitted to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve a Part 2 Secured by Design Accreditation pursuant to condition No 7 attached to planning permission Ref 4819/18 granted on 10 October 2019 in accordance with the application dated 7 October 2022, are approved.

Preliminary Matters

2. On the appeal form the appellant indicated that the reason for the appeal was for 'Refused permission to vary or remove a condition'. However, it has been confirmed by the appellant that 'Refused to approve any matter required by a condition on a previous planning permission (other than those specified above)' should have been selected. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The application form cites the address number as '463'. However, the planning permission Ref 4819/18, decision notice Ref 4819/18/04 and the appeal form refer to the address number as '463 - 489'. I consider this is more accurate and have therefore used this in the address.

Background and Main Issue

4. This appeal follows the refusal by the Council to approve the details submitted pursuant to condition No 7 attached to planning permission Ref 4819/18. This condition deals with 'Secured by Design' and states the following:

'Prior to carrying out any above ground works of the building hereby approved, details shall be submitted to and approved, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve a Part 2 "Secured by Design" Accreditation. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.'

Within three months of first occupation of each building or part of a building or use, a "Secured by Design" accreditation shall be obtained for such building or part of such building or use.'

5. The reason for the condition is stated as being *'To ensure that Secured by Design principles are implemented into the development as far as reasonable and in accordance with policy 7.3 of the London Plan (March 2016) and Policy LP26 of the Council's Local Plan'*.
6. While I note the appellant has requested full discharge of condition No 7 on the application form, the details submitted only relate to the first part of it. No details have been provided to confirm that Secured by Design accreditation has been obtained for any part of the development and therefore the second part of condition No 7 still requires to be complied with at the appropriate time. I have considered the appeal on this basis.
7. Based on the above, the main issue is whether the submitted details pursuant to condition No 7 would be sufficient and acceptable to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve Part 2 Secured by Design Accreditation.

Reasons

8. To address the first part of condition No 7, the appellant submitted document reference 60.103 with associated listed drawings. These documents provide a reasonably detailed list of the proposed security measures to be provided. The appellant in their appeal statement also confirms that this list follows all relevant recommendations and guidance as outlined in Secured by Design – Homes 2019 and 2023, and captures the changes made in the security industry in response to emerging crime patterns and methodology.
9. The Metropolitan Police London Safety Centre - Design Out Crime Office (DOCO) were consulted by the Council on the details submitted. The DOCO advised that the proposed security measures reflected advice provided previously but that the standards it was based on had been superseded. The DOCO also indicated that the appellant did not consult with it directly regarding the details and it considered they are based on out-of-date standards and contain insufficient information to demonstrate that the development would achieve Secured by Design accreditation. The Council has advised that it has no reason to question these findings and refused the application on this basis. However, other than the DOCO advising that the security ratings of communal doorsets, gating, and doorsets providing access were not provided, little evidence of other details which are missing, or which standards would not achieve Secured by Design accreditation have been provided by the DOCO or the Council.
10. In relation to the raised missing security rating for the communal and private accesses, the doorset security and construction standards are detailed in the provided document. The DOCO provide little reason why these would not be

sufficient to achieve the Secured by Design accreditation. While I note that named products and fabricators are not provided in the document, no evidence that this level of detail is necessary for the Secured by Design accreditation at this early stage has been presented by the DOCO or the Council.

11. Whilst the DOCO has not yet indicated that they are satisfied with every detail, enough information has been submitted to give me sufficient confidence that accreditation can be achieved. The appellant advises in their appeal statement, that they would be willing to work with the DOCO to review the details to ensure Secured by Design accreditation would be successfully achieved. To meet condition No 7's requirement to obtain Secured by Design accreditation, the appellant agrees that the DOCO will require a site inspection to be completed to confirm compliance and inclusion of all appropriate security measures.
12. There is little compelling evidence to indicate that the details presented are not sufficient to demonstrate the development could achieve the Secured by Design accreditation. Furthermore, condition No 7 requires that prior to occupation of the development Secured by Design accreditation must be obtained.
13. In conclusion the details submitted pursuant to condition No 7 are sufficient and acceptable to demonstrate that such building or such part of a building can achieve a Part 2 Secured by Design Accreditation.

Other matters

14. The DOCO advises that they would strongly object to any altering of the wording of the condition. However, the appeal only considers the sufficiency and acceptability of the details submitted in complying with the first part of condition No 7. No change of the condition's wording has been undertaken.
15. While it may have been beneficial for the appellant to have consulted with the DOCO prior to appeal and also engaged in pre-application with the Council, neither of these are mandatory.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

J Symmons

INSPECTOR