

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2020

by Alex Hutson MRTPI CMLI MARborA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/20/3255517

22 Monkham Lane, Woodford Green IG8 0NS

- 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 Trevor Braman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 0750/20, dated 5 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary fence with gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The proposal is described on the application form as 'Retention of Means of Enclosure', albeit that the application form also indicates that at the time the application was made the works had not started. At some point in the recent past, some new front boundary treatment has been erected at the appeal property. However, this does not reflect that which is shown on the submitted plans. The appellant requests that I determine the appeal on the basis of what has been built and a photograph of this. Nonetheless, no plans are provided and to do so would, in my view, prejudice the interests of the Council who has not had the opportunity to comment on the scheme.
3. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans and that the proposal is not retrospective. I have taken the description of the proposed development from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form which reflect this. This is shown in the banner heading above. Should the appellant wish to pursue consent for the front boundary treatment as built, a retrospective application in respect of it should be made to the Council.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a contemporary, two storey, detached dwelling located within a wider residential area. Dwellings along Monkham Lane typically display front boundary treatments comprising a variety of low-level brick walls, narrow brick piers, railings and hedges, or a combination of these. This prevailing form of front boundary treatment allows views through to front gardens and affords an

open and spatial quality to the streetscene. This contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The proposal seeks to erect a front boundary consisting of wide rendered piers with a low rendered wall, painted wooden panels and an automated vehicular gate between them. According to the submitted plans, the proposal would range in height from 1660mm to 2095mm and would step down in response to the sloping topography of Markhams Lane.
7. I acknowledge that the appellant has sought a contemporary design to reflect that of the appeal property. However, given the overall height of the proposal and lack of visual permeability due to its form and materials, it would appear as an overly dominant and visually incongruous feature at considerable odds with the prevailing form of front boundary treatments along Markham Lane. In addition, it would markedly erode the open and spatial quality of the streetscene.
8. Though the appellant suggests that the painted wooden panels would allow some views through to landscaping beyond, this does not appear to be the case on the plans and, in itself, or along with a landscaping condition, would not overcome my concerns in any event. In addition, I observed that the presence of the wide verge to the front of the appeal property would do little to reduce the undue impact and visibility of the proposed boundary treatment.
9. The appellant makes reference to the front boundary treatment of numerous other dwellings along Markhams Lane, Markhams Drive and Markhams Avenue, all of which I visited. However, none of the examples reflect the proposal before me and they all appeared to me to comprise a variety of low-level brick walls, brick piers, railings and hedges, or a combination of these. As such, these examples do not justify a planning permission.
10. In light of my above findings, I conclude that the proposal would give rise to considerable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 adopted 2018, which require, amongst other things, development to respect the local character of the area and to maintain or improve the appearance of the locality or streetscene. The proposal would also conflict with the guidance of the Redbridge Housing Design Supplementary Planning Document 2019, which advises that the design of boundary treatments should reflect local character.

Other matters

11. The appellant suggests that the design and means of enclosure has in part been influenced by the need to ensure security and privacy. Nonetheless, privacy is not normally considered to be as important to the front of a house as it is to the rear. With regard to security, the appellant could explore other means to achieve this, if necessary, such as an alarm or CCTV system, or a secure front boundary treatment which would be more sensitive to the character and appearance of the area. As such, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Alex Hutson INSPECTOR