
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 01 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/16/3164373

42 Harts Grove, Woodford Green, Redbridge IG8 0BN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms C Longman and Mr R West against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 4717/16 is dated 5 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage at the front of the house and erection of a two storey extension to the side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the existing garage at the front of the house and erection of a two storey extension to the side at 42 Harts Grove, Woodford Green, Redbridge IG8 0BN in accordance with the application Ref 4717/16 dated 5 October 2016 and subject to the conditions in the schedule below.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the appeal was lodged, the Council within its statement has given its putative reason for refusal which is that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Woodford Green Conservation Area and the host property.
3. I acknowledge the discrepancy identified by the Council in that the side elevation of the proposal, as shown on drawing number 1291 / 08 Rev. C, does not show the gable above the first floor extension. Notwithstanding this omission, I am satisfied that I have been able to give full consideration to the impact of the proposal based on the information provided.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Woodford Green Conservation Area (CA) and the host property.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the CA and is part of a residential estate characterised by dwellings interspersed with mature woodland planting. The
-

site is accessed via a long driveway and although the dwelling is large it is substantially concealed from public view by densely planted mature trees.

6. The extension would result in a significant increase to the overall width of the dwelling, which has already been the subject of a double storey extension to the side. Notwithstanding this, the extension would be subordinate in height to the main dwelling, consistent with the forward building line, being set back at first floor level and would incorporate forward facing gable features that would reflect the design of the original house. Moreover the extension, like the main dwelling itself, would be substantially concealed from public viewpoints whilst being significantly separated from the nearest dwellings to the front and rear and well screened by retained dense woodland.
7. This proposal follows in the wake of a previous planning permission granted on appeal for the demolition of the existing garage and the erection of a replacement garage to the side. The proposal subject to this appeal would substantially conform to the footprint of that development. The approved garage necessitated the removal of several protected trees which, on account of their poor condition together with the opportunity afforded to better manage the remaining woodland, was found to be acceptable by the Inspector dealing with that case. The same trees would be affected by the current proposal and from the information provided I have no reason to disagree with my colleague that their removal would be acceptable. It seems to me that the impact on views of woodland within the appeal site resulting from the development would be negligible given the extent of unaffected tree cover.
8. I have considered the argument that the grant of planning permission would set a precedent for other similar developments. However each application and appeal must be determined on its own individual merits and a generalised concern of this nature would not in itself justify withholding planning permission in this case.
9. For the aforementioned reasons I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would not result in harm to the visual amenity of the host property. Accordingly it would comply with Policy SP3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Core Strategy 2008 and Policies BD1, BD5 and E3 of the London Borough of Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan Document 2008 insofar as they seek to promote high quality design that has regard to the distinctive character of the area and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Whilst the proposal would not strictly adhere to guidance in the Council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2012 regarding the set back of two storey side extensions, the circumstances of the appeal site as set out above justify an exception being made to that guidance in this case.

Other Matter

10. The distance between the proposed extension and the locally listed ice house is such that the development would not result in any significant harm to the setting of this structure.

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. Conditions specifying the plans, requiring the use of matching materials and requiring the

protection of retained trees during the construction period are necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area. A condition requiring the preparation and implementation of a Woodland Management Plan is necessary to ensure the healthy retention of protected trees and to introduce replacement planting for those trees lost to the development. A further condition is necessary requiring the replacement of any new trees that die or are removed within 5 years of planting in the interests of retaining the quality of the managed woodland.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other points raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1291 01; 1291 02; 1291 03; 1291 04; 1291 05 Rev.B; 1291 06 Rev.B; 1291 07 Rev.C; 1291 08 Rev.C; 1291 09 Rev.B.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
- 4) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved.
- 5) A Woodland Management Plan for the woodland within the curtilage of 42 Harts Grove shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted. The Management Plan shall also include details of all proposed tree planting. All works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Woodland Management Plan.
- 6) If within a period of five years from the date of planting of any tree, that tree is removed, uprooted or dies, another tree of the same species and size shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written approval to any variation.