
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3285872

10 Lessingham Avenue, Clayhall, Ilford, Essex, IG5 0BJ

- 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 Mrs Kaur against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3112/21, dated 23 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is retention of side boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development of the side boundary wall was complete. I also note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey end of terrace house located next to a crossroad junction where Lessingham Avenue meets Stradbroke Grove and Herent Drive. The site is particularly prominent because it is a corner plot and on a hill. The boundary wall runs along the side of Stradbroke Grove at the rear of the appeal property and comprises an approximately 2 metre high white rendered wall topped with an approximately 1 metre high contemporary, horizontal layered, wooden fence. The wall steps down the hill away from the junction.
5. The boundary walls of other houses at the junction comprise different materials and designs but are lower than that of the appeal property. The lower walls enable some views across to the rear of neighbouring houses which contribute to the streetscape. This also gives a relatively open character at the approaches to the junction from the road and pavement.
6. The appeal property abuts the pavement, whereas other houses at the junction are mainly set back behind their boundary walls such that their 2 storey side elevations do not meet the pavement edge. As a result, the appeal property is

more visually dominant than other corner properties and somewhat overbearing. The side wall adds to this visual dominance because it is higher than the boundary walls of other houses and because of the prominence of the site. Furthermore, it restricts views across the rear of neighbouring properties and reduces the open appearance that I have identified as part of the character of the area at this location.

7. I note that 241 Stradbroke Grove, opposite the site, has a rendered side wall and wooden close board fence. However, the fence is set back behind the wall and in combination does not appear as high as the development subject of this appeal and is less dominant and visually intrusive. Also, there are views across the side wall at No 241 to the rear of neighbouring properties retaining the open appearance which is not the case at the appeal property. As such, I do not consider it to be directly comparable to the development. Regarding the side wall at 155 Herent Drive to which the appellant refers, I have no details in terms of whether the development has planning consent. In anycase, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.
8. Overall, I conclude that the development is visually intrusive and out of keeping with other development in the area and would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. It therefore conflicts with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) which require good design that has regard for the surrounding area in terms of massing, scale, and design and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality.

Other Matters

9. I have considered all other matters raised in support of the appeal, including the processing of the planning application and the potential for the development to improve security at the property. However, they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR