
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2017

by S Jones MA DipLP

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

Decision date: 19 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/17/3171510

The Travellers Friend, 496-498 High Road, Woodford Green IG8 0PN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Zacharia against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 5573/16, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is new second floor to existing planning approval 0251/15.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on
 - a) the character and appearance of the locally listed host building and the surrounding Woodford Green Conservation Area (CA)
 - b) and on the living conditions of future occupiers of the development with regard to internal space and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. In determining this appeal, I have a statutory duty under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to consider whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA. The significance of this CA lies in its location on the edge of Epping Forest where early hamlets grew up along the Woodford Road, and the area is characterised by loose knit settlements, green spaces, mature trees and ponds. The Travellers Friend is a longstanding public house in a mainly residential area about 100m from the green space with its ponds and trees at the green at Woodford, and as such contributes to the significance of the CA. It is also a non designated heritage asset since it is a locally listed building considered to be of distinctive local importance. The CA and the public house as heritage assets must be given special attention and consideration in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
 4. The property is an attractive distinctive detached building in the CA. Although only two storey it sits slightly taller and slightly more set forward than
-

adjoining two storey buildings, and its white render further emphasises that prominence in contrast to the surrounding buildings. The proposal follows on from an earlier grant of planning permission reference 0251.15 for a new restaurant and extension, and would add a further 1 bedroom flat extension.

5. In combination with the existing extensions and alterations to the property, the proposed first floor extension would increase the size of the building further. The extra bulk created would be an overbearing and dominant addition that would detract from the original host building detrimentally affecting its distinctive appearance. While the extension would be at the back of the building it would be possible to see it from the side and angled views from the street. I appreciate that the appellant may feel there might be limited views of the proposed development from some locations so that its impact in the locality would be reduced, however from my site visit I conclude that it is highly visible from the High Road and particularly from the Inman Road side and roads around the green at Woodford. I appreciate that in the CA as a whole the style of buildings is mixed. Nevertheless, the harm to the appearance of the locally listed building means that it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole.
6. In the parlance of the Framework, the harm I have identified to the significance of the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial. However, any harm would require a clear and convincing justification. I appreciate that the proposal may comply with other aims of the Framework by providing another dwelling in a sustainable location. However, that public benefit does not outweigh the importance that must be given to the designated asset's conservation. I conclude that it would not overcome the harm arising.
7. I therefore conclude this would be an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding CA and the locally listed host building contrary to Policies BD1 and Policy E3 of the 2008 Redbridge Borough Wide Primary Policies Development Plan (BW) because in these policies new developments should respect heritage assets without detriment, and be compatible with and appropriate to the amenity and the context of the locality. I conclude it would also conflict with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan (LNP) and Policy SP3 of the 2008 Redbridge Core Strategy Development Plan (CS) because it would not preserve or enhance the CA or respect the amenity of the locality generally.

Living Conditions

8. The LNP Policy 3.5 sets minimum space standards for Gross Internal Area (GIA) for new dwellings. Although the appellant refers to a shower room, the submitted proposed floor plan clearly refers to the flat having a bathroom and it shows it with a bath. Moreover, the Council calculates that the separate bedroom would be around 10m² thus being in excess of the 7.5m² GIA internal space requirements that are set out in the London Plan. It seems to me therefore that the bedroom could accommodate a double bed. Also, it appears that the lower internal space standard of 39m² GIA (which can be reduced to 37m² if there is a shower room) may only apply to an open plan studio, which has not been proposed here.
9. In these circumstances, as it would not fall within the studio flat category, the evidence indicates that the proposed flat would likely fall into the higher space requirement of 50m² GIA, to meet the LNP standards. The proposed flat with

less than 39m² GIA would fall significantly short, thus it would not provide high quality internal accommodation meeting the needs of future occupiers contrary to Policy 3.5 of the LNP minimum space standards.

10. It is acknowledged that the flat may be similar to the size of the manager's flat already granted permission. However, I am not aware of the circumstances that led the Council to find that flat acceptable, it is possible it was indicated that the flat was for a single manager, restricted to a 1 bed 1 person flat. Whatever the circumstances were, the managers accommodation does not persuade me to find the proposed flat acceptable
11. The proposed bedroom would have one window. Although this is not shown on Drawing 14.120/12 on the proposed external side elevation, it is shown on Drawing 14.120/11 in the layout of the proposed flat, and referred to in the appellant's statement. It would face northwards towards the flank wall of No 500 High Road. It would be enclosed by that wall and have a limited outlook because of the height and proximity of the adjacent building and the shadow of the host building. I conclude that because of this and its northerly aspect, it would not have good access to outlook or light, as the appellant contends.
12. In view of the above, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of future occupiers and it would conflict with Policy 3.5 of the LNP as already outlined, and Policy BD1 of the BW and Policy SP3 of the CS because it would not create a high quality sustainable development that secures the longterm needs of residents, and because its layout would not contribute to design quality overall.

Other Matters

13. I noted that the proprietors have invested in and upgraded the property and that it was immaculately presented to a high standard. I conclude that this aspect and any others raised cannot overcome my findings on the main issues.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jones

INSPECTOR