
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2025 by A Conteh

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3367397

40 Gyllyngdune Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford, IG3 9HJ

- 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 Miah against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 0489/25.
 - The development is described as "Front porch. Replace all windows. Reduction of front porch size and retention of windows. (Part Retrospective)."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The proposal seeks to retain the already replaced windows on the front elevation and to replace the already constructed porch with a smaller porch. I observed the windows were in accordance with the plans submitted and have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. The appeal scheme affects a property situated in a conservation area and therefore I shall have special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (BECA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal (2014) categorises low-density development with a rich variety of English Vernacular style detailing as a significant feature of the BECA. Bungalows bear likeness in scale, form and use of a limited palette of materials, which gives the area a sense of homogeneity while subtle variations create an air of informality. Consequently, the BECA derives considerable significance from the consistent and complementary architectural style and detailing of the dwellings.

7. The evidence before me is that the appeal dwelling previously had the recessed porch characteristic of this style of property in the BECA. Permission has previously been granted for a modest flat roofed porch covering this feature, however it has not yet been built. Instead, a Classical-style pedimented porch and columns have been constructed, which are distinctly at odds with the Arts and Crafts-inspired architectural language which dominates the surrounding context, and which was a feature of the appeal property until the recent alterations. That porch harms the appearance of the dwelling and the BECA as a result. The evidence before me is that this porch does not benefit from planning permission.
8. The proposed porch would have similar Classical-style detailing and would be very close to the bay window, which is a key feature of these bungalows. While it would be subordinate in scale to the bungalow, its detailing, scale, shallow pitched roof and close relationship to the bay would appear distinctly different to the traditional form of the dwelling and would detract from the traditional and characteristic features which contribute positively to the BECA. Therefore, it would be a visually harmful addition to the property.
9. While the appeal property joins a host of dwellings in the area sporting uPVC windows, in this case their dark frames and tinted glazing clashes greatly with the widespread use of light coloured frames and clear glazing throughout the area. Additionally, the window frames and openings bear little relation to the dwelling's previous style and the proposal demonstrates little effort to respect the appearance of the original detailing, which remains prevalent in the area. Due to the change to the windows therefore, the appeal property now stands in stark contrast to the prevailing character of the streetscape, appearing more incongruous than the subtle variations which exist throughout the wider BECA.
10. The proposed porch and current windows would together give the appeal site a contemporary and urban feel which would not preserve or enhance the suburban and traditional characteristics which contribute to the significance of the BECA. The proposal would therefore diminish the appearance of the dwelling and harm the character and appearance of the BECA.
11. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out that such harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal. The appellant indicates that the proposal would meet the needs of future occupants, however it has not been demonstrated that the same cannot be achieved with the previously permitted scheme. In any case this would be a private benefit, and I give it very limited weight. The proposed porch reduction would better comply with supplementary planning guidance which encourages a limited projection of porches, set-back behind existing bay features, however the existing porch has not been demonstrated to be lawful, so is not a relevant point of comparison. This does not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal.
12. The appellant has provided visual examples of comparable window designs in the BECA, however, I saw on site that these represented very few properties and do not reflect the character of the BECA as a whole. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence before me of whether these developments benefit from planning permission or how or when they came to be built. There is therefore no demonstrable lack of consistency in the Council's decisions on such development in the area.

13. The appellant has also submitted evidence of what they consider to be appropriate porch styles near the appeal site which they have expressed an intention to recreate. However, these are different to the design proposed here, so do not weigh in favour of this proposal. In any case, I cannot consider alternative plans which are not before me.
14. For the reasons above, I find that the current windows harm the character and appearance of the BECA, and the proposed porch would also harm its character and appearance. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (adopted 2018) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 which seek to ensure high quality design and promote preservation of heritage assets.
15. The proposal would also fail to comply with supplementary planning guidance contained within The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide 2018 and the Framework which seek to achieve good design.

Other Matters

16. The appellant refers to a telephone call with the Council's Enforcement team, however this appears to have been informal advice only. I have had regard to the Council's formal decision on the appeal proposal and have considered the scheme on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Conteh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR