



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/24/3352056

92 Breamore Road, Ilford IG3 9NN

- 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 Mr Imran Alam against the decision of London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1344/24.
 - The development is a single storey side / rear structure with a plastic sheet roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the decision notice and appeal form. In my view, this more clearly and concisely describes the development, and I have used it for my decision.
3. The structure has been erected; therefore, this is a retrospective proposal, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2024, and accordingly, for the purposes of this decision, I have referred to the latest version of the Framework. However, the content of the Framework has not been materially altered in respect of the main issues in this appeal.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the development on: -
 - i) the character and appearance of the area, including whether it would preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, and
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

6. No. 92 is a semi-detached property located on the southern side of Breamore Road. It is part of a row of properties of the same form and is part of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the

Conservation Area. This is echoed in policy LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2023 (Local Plan) and policy HC1 of the London Plan March 2021 (London Plan).

7. The Conservation Area comprises a planned residential estate of 1920/30s bungalows with the character derived from the grid layout, the form of the properties and their architectural features. Whilst having been extended, the appeal property has the characteristic features of a projecting bay and gable roof elements to the front, which are replicated on the neighbouring properties and form part of the cohesive pattern of development.
8. The addition to the side is flush with the front elevation and has a garage appearance, which is a feature found to other properties in the street scene. Beyond the front façade, the structure extends along the side boundary and wraps around the existing rear extension. It is limited in height; however, the structural form and materials of a timber frame with plastic sheeting extending off the breeze block boundary wall have a somewhat temporary appearance. This is at odds with the vernacular style of the bungalow, and the scale of the development conflicts with the advice in the Council's Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guidance, June 2018 (Design Guidance) which indicates that linked side-rear extensions will not be supported.
9. The appellant has referred to a number of examples which they consider to be similar. These predominately relate to two-storey properties and/or pre-date the Design Guidance and as such, I do not find them to be directly comparable. Additionally, the aim of the Design Guidance is to provide advice on alterations which can have wider impacts on the character and significance of the estate overall.
10. While I acknowledge that the canopy-style structure has an openness and subservience, the materials and the extent of the development enveloping the bungalow fail to harmonise with the host property. Consequently, it creates an incongruous feature which is harmful to the character of the area.
11. 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 the level of harm. The impact on the Conservation Area would be less than substantial and, therefore, in accordance with the Framework, should be balanced against the public benefits. Providing covered amenity space, the alterations are primarily for the private benefits of the occupiers, and there are no identified public benefits which outweigh the harm.
12. I therefore conclude that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and fails to preserve the significance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area as a whole. Thus, the proposal is contrary to policies LP26, LP30 and LP33 of the Local Plan and policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), which, amongst other things, seek to ensure developments are of high quality and preserve the character and appearance of Conservation Areas. There is also conflict with the Council's Design Guidance in relation to the form of the development and materials.

Relationship with the Neighbour

13. Extending along the side boundary, the proposal brings the property closer to the neighbour (No.94). However, the projection above the boundary treatment is limited, and the addition has a transparent, lightweight appearance.
14. The structure primarily aligns with the flank elevations of the two properties, and given their form the windows in the side elevation are likely to be secondary windows. Nonetheless, I do not find that the development is of a scale or form which would have a significantly enclosing effect to be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property with regard to outlook.
15. The visual aesthetics of the development formed part of my considerations above relating to character and appearance.
16. Consequently, I find that the proposal accords with the requirements of Local Plan policy LP26 in terms of not adversely impacting the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in relation to outlook, scale and massing.

Other Matters

17. The relevant Local Plan policies identified in the decision notice align with the objectives of the Framework (sections 12 and 16), which promotes good design and visually attractive developments that are sympathetic to local character, and the protection of the historic environment. The appellant has also highlighted various other elements of the Framework in relation to small and medium sites and efficient use of land. As a householder extension, this proposal does not change the use of the land as a single dwellinghouse, and it is not a large plot which is significantly underutilised. I have considered the Framework as a whole, and these are not matters which outweigh the identified harm and conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR