



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2026

by Felicity Thompson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/C/25/3369444

Land at 12 Westrow Gardens, Seven Kings, Ilford IG3 9NE

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ali Choudhury against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The notice was issued on 18 June 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is the unauthorised installation of front sliding metal gates in the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - (I) Remove the front gates in their entirety, and
 - (II) As well as the railings above the existing dwarf walls and
 - (III) Remove all resultant debris and materials from site.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is three months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Decision

1. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected and varied by:
 - 1) Deleting the text in section 3 of the enforcement notice and replacing it with the following: "The installation of front sliding metal gates, and railings above the existing dwarf walls."
 - 2) Deleting requirement (I) and (II) in section 5 of the notice and replacing them with the following requirement: "(I) Remove the front sliding metal gates, and the railings above the existing dwarf walls in their entirety."
 - 3) The consequential renumbering of requirement (III).
2. Subject to the correction and variations, the appeal is dismissed, the enforcement notice is upheld, and planning permission is refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended.

The Enforcement Notice

3. The allegation refers only to the installation of front sliding metal gates. However, the notice also requires the removal of the railings above the existing dwarf walls, despite those railings not being identified in the allegation. While they should have been included, it is clear from the reasons for issuing the notice and requirements, that it applies to the railings as well. I shall therefore correct the allegation as set out above and make consequential variations to the requirements; doing so will cause no injustice as it will not change the notice in substance nor increase the scope of the requirements.

The appeal on ground (a) the deemed planning application

4. The main issue is whether the gates and railings preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area.
5. It is stated in The Bungalow Estate Conservation Area Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document June 2018 (SPD) that the Bungalow Estate Conservation Area (BECA) is of particular architectural significance, with the general character of the estate being typified by 1920-30s bungalows set within a garden landscape setting. As such a bungalow, the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the significance of the BECA.
6. It is also stated in the SPD, that the original character of the BECA, is focussed on a number of key features, which include, amongst others, low level boundary treatments and soft landscaping. It goes on, that the character of front gardens and boundary treatments including walls and hedges are part of the significance of the BECA, traditionally these areas featured low boundary enclosures, which I observed.
7. It is noted that the development of front gardens and the replacement and removal of boundary treatments to facilitate access by private vehicles has significantly eroded the character of the BECA.
8. In this case although the gates and railings are permeable and the original wall has not been removed, given the overall height and material, they appear unacceptably enclosing, which is out of keeping with surrounding frontages and contrasts with the sense of openness that characterises the BECA. Consequently, the gates and railings are a dominant and incongruous feature that appreciably harm and therefore do not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BECA.
9. Given the scale of the development within the context of the BECA as a whole, I consider the harm to be less than substantial. Nevertheless, I am mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) says substantial weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset and any harm to such assets should require clear and convincing justification.
10. Moreover, that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of such an asset, that harm should be weighed against the proposal's public benefits including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. This requires a balancing exercise of harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The appellant has not sought to demonstrate, nor do I consider there are public benefits associated with the development.
12. Consequently, there are no public benefits to outweigh the substantial weight that I am required to attach to the heritage asset's conservation. Overall, I conclude that the gates and railings do not accord with the design and heritage protection aims of Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 (March 2018). They also fail to accord with national policy which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment and advice in the Council's SPD.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice with a correction and variations and refuse to grant planning permission on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Felicity Thompson

INSPECTOR