



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2024

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/24/3348045

79 Water Lane, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9HW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs S Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 3045/23.
 - The development proposed is demolition of garage and erection of a single storey side extension to create an annex for an elderly relative.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the significance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The Bungalow Estate CA consists of an extensive estate with its significance derived from the architectural style and historical interest of the assemblage, pattern and character of bungalows built in the 1920s and 1930s set within a verdant landscaped setting. The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, adopted June 2018, identifies that the individual character and significance of the bungalows is focussed upon a number of key features. These include terracotta roof tiles and chimneys, pebbledash/crushed stone rendered brick walls, front bay windows with either decorative timber and rendered gable or small hipped tiled roofs, recessed front entrance doors, timber framed windows and entrance doors, diamond oriel side windows and low-level boundary treatments and soft landscaping.
4. No 79 Water Lane (No 79) is in the Bungalow Estate CA and forms part of an established residential area where it is located on the eastern side of Water Lane close to the junction with Parkway. It comprises an existing bungalow of modest proportions and forms part of a rhythm of detached and semi-detached bungalows that have a distinctive pattern of staggered building lines at oblique angles to the road set behind shallow front gardens and parking areas. A coherence of local character exists despite some variations in individual frontage styles, features, finishes and fenestration. In those respects, the property has been previously altered to replace original timber windows and doors with more contemporary designs and uPVC materials. A large detached double garage has also been added at the side and a single

storey extension at the rear. Nonetheless, No 79 retains the majority of other key and characteristic features of the grouping of bungalows and thereby, makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.

5. The existing garage despite its significant footprint, width and depth when viewed from Water Lane, is a subservient feature due to its detachment from the bungalow, its modest roof height and materials that do not look out of place. Nonetheless, it contributes little to the character, appearance and significance of the CA and is suitable in principle to be demolished. The proposal seeks to replace it with a single storey side extension that would be of a lower height due to its flat roof design. However, although a similar width to the existing garage, the introduction of a significant extension to the frontage of No 79 would result in continuous built form that would appear incongruous in the setting. The considerable and incompatible width and bulk of the extension adjoining the side of the existing pitched roof bungalow would be emphasised by the visual contrast of the flat roof, together with the introduction of windows and a side doorway of differing proportions that would not complement the character of the existing bay windows and the main entrance to the bungalow. As a result, the proposal would be viewed as an insubordinate, discordant and harmful addition to the existing bungalow and would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area.
6. I have taken into account that the extension would be set back from the front building line of the dwelling with a recessed section and also set in further from the shared boundary with No 77. Matching materials could also be secured. However, those factors do not overcome the harm identified which would be particularly evident when approaching along Water Lane due to the oblique positioning of No 79 relative to the road and the staggered building lines of properties to the north. The harm would be worsened by the extension obscuring some existing views of a diamond oriel window on the side elevation and part of a chimney at ground floor level, both of which are key features of the CA and positively contribute to the architectural style of the bungalow.
7. In reaching the above findings, I observed that there is a difference in style and appearance of properties in the wider area, together with examples of other flat roofed side extensions and other alterations to properties nearby on Water Lane. However, the existing side extensions that I observed in the locality are different to the proposal as they are typically subservient to the original dwelling. As such the diversity of built form close by and in the wider CA does not offer precedent for or justify the harm identified.
8. As the site is in a CA, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.
9. The proposal would result in harm, rather than the positive contribution to local character, distinctiveness and conservation or enhancement of heritage assets desired by Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP), adopted March 2018. The harm caused would be significant

in terms of the effect upon the character and appearance of No 79 and its immediate surroundings. However, the harm would be localised to limited public viewpoints and therefore, would be less than substantial to the significance of the Bungalow Estate CA as a whole. In such circumstances, Policy LP33 of the LP and the Framework require that the less than substantial harm be weighed against the public benefits.

10. The public benefits in this case are that the development would provide additional living space in an incidental annex for an elderly relative in a location that is accessible to local services and facilities in Ilford. I understand and sympathise with the wishes of the appellant to provide accommodation for their family. However, the identified harm is likely to endure beyond the duration of the personal circumstances for which the accommodation in the single storey extension is sought. Moreover, any associated benefits in terms of reducing demand pressure upon local care services would be limited by the scale of the proposal. It follows that the public benefits do not outweigh the great weight to be given to the less than substantial harm I have identified.
11. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and consequently would fail to preserve or enhance the significance of the Bungalow Estate CA. The proposal, therefore, conflicts with Policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the LP.

Other Matters

12. It is common ground between the main parties that the development would provide a suitable living environment for its future occupiers and would not result in unacceptable impacts on the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of matters of outlook, light, privacy and noise, or in terms of parking arrangements and highway safety. Based on the evidence before me, together with my own observations of the property and its relationship with those surrounding, I have no reason to take a different view. Moreover, although the site is within Flood Zone 3, suitable flood-risk safety and resilience measures could be secured by condition to ensure no increased risk of flooding within the site or its surroundings. However, the absence of harm in each of those respects is a neutral factor and does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. I have considered the public benefits of the development in assessing the proposal against the main issue. The public benefits identified would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the less than substantial harm to the significance of the Bungalow Estate CA. The proposal, thereby, conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR