



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020

by Andre Pinto BA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/19/3242424

10 Mornington Road, Woodford Green IG8 0TS

- 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 D Gabhari against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 2171/19, dated 13 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as planning application for redevelopment to provide demolition of existing building with retention of key features of the façade and construction of six bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Woodford Green Conservation Area (the CA) and whether any harm to the significance of the CA is outbalanced by any public benefits.

Reasons

3. The CA is characterised by its open and verdant character, centred on long green open spaces, creating an easily recognisable and distinctive plan form. This open feel, created by large open spaces within and outside the Conservation Area, is complemented by mature gardens, low density low rise buildings which define the CA. Overall, the area has a suburban and semi-rural feel, derived and linked to its history. Its significance lies in its open verdant character and the good quality, well preserved varied architecture of the area with buildings representing the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, imparting a sense of historical continuity.
4. The appeal site is located within a specific sub-section of the CA, characterised by its open feel and large, detached, single-family dwelling houses, individually designed, set in sizable gardens and facing the road. The appeal site is one of such large residential dwellings, characteristic of this section of the CA, therefore making a positive contribution to the character and appeal of the area.
5. The proposed development would be considerably larger than the existing dwelling, have substantially larger roof and introduce a two-storey element

approximately one metre from the boundary of the neighbouring house, 8 Mornington Road.

6. Although the proposed development and in particular the proposed roof extension over the existing garage, would be designed in such a way as to integrate with retained elements of the existing building, it would nevertheless close a gap at first floor level which provides a view of the trees behind, and open skies between the dwellings.
7. Furthermore, one of the key characteristics of this particular sub-section of the CA, is the detached nature of the dwellings and their sitting within large, verdant plots. The existing gap between No 10 and No 8 provides a visual break, which reinforces their detached nature and individual character.
8. The varied architecture and form of the buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site offers scope for some degree of chance within the local townscape. Nevertheless, given the proposed scale, substantial roof form and proximity to No 8, the development proposed would constitute a visually awkward, discordant addition to the CA.
9. The development would not, therefore, preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to the Policies LP26 on promoting high quality design and LP33 aimed at conserving, protecting and enhancing heritage assets of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018), and Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) which aims to preserve local character, good architecture and protect London's heritage assets and historic environment, respectively.
10. The identified harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial in the terms of The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In such circumstances, the Framework requires that the harm is weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
11. No particular public benefits have been brought to my attention in relation to the proposed development, albeit I recognise that there would be private benefits for the occupants of the dwelling. I also acknowledge that there would be some public benefit in terms of improving housing stock and that the investment would be of some benefit to the local economy. However, any such public benefits would be very modest given the small scale of the development. These would be substantially outweighed by the relatively significant harm arising, bearing in mind the importance and protection given to designated heritage assets by statute and national and local planning policy.

Other Matters

12. Representations have been made on this appeal which I have considered as part of my decision making process. Nevertheless, although I have taken these representations into account, these have not altered my overall decision.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andre Pinto

INSPECTOR