



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 April 2022

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/22/3288774

26 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green, London, IG8 0JA

- 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 Ms Mehreen Matin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3064/21, dated 19 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of garden room at the end of the rear garden'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a garden room at 26 Kings Avenue, Woodford Green, London, IG8 0JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 3064/21, dated 19 July 2021, subject to the following 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: 20-29-OS-001, 20-629-PL-120revA, 20-629-PL-110revA and 20-629-PL-110.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Woodford Broadway Conservation Area (CA). In considering proposals for planning permission, the duty imposed by section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation.
3. The development plan includes policies LP26, LP30 and LP 33 in the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) and policies D4 and HC1 in the London Plan, which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high quality design and of a scale that enhances the character of the dwelling and respects the surrounding area and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

4. The appeal site is located in the Woodford Broadway CA, in a leafy residential area whose character derives from the mainly high quality detached and semi-detached dwellings built in the Edwardian period with a high level of detail and ornamentation that is typical of that period and set on large, leafy plots. The appeal dwelling is one of a pair of modern semi-detached houses built in a mock Edwardian style. On its rear elevation is an imposing, contemporary style single storey projection with a flat roof behind a parapet wall which extends across the width of the pair. The dwelling also has a contemporary style canopy structure attached to the rear of that. It is sited on a large plot, from which both the adjacent traditional dwelling at no 24 and a modern dwelling adjacent to the other half of the pair can be seen. The character of the site is therefore a mix of both traditional and contemporary styles.
5. The proposed garden room would be sited at the end of the large rear garden, replacing an existing outbuilding and bounded by the 2m high fences and planting which separate it from its neighbours. To the rear it would be bounded by tall trees along the rail embankment. It would form an L-shape with walls clad in timber composite cladding in an oak finish, a flat roof with a green roof system and large aluminium windows. It would be smaller than a previously refused outbuilding (4385/19) which had a rectangular form and a dual pitched roof. Nonetheless, at between 3m and 6.45m in depth, 10.2m in width and with a height of 3m, it would be a large building. It would, however, be almost identical to a previous scheme approved in the same position (4221/20) and would have the same footprint and materials. The only difference is that that scheme had a lower height of 2.5m and a floor level some 500mm below natural ground level.
6. At my visit I noted that any outbuildings in rear gardens are generally hidden from view from the street and that would be the case with this proposal. From the rear garden of the appeal site, I was able to see only a small shed at no 24 and a large outbuilding, also with a flat roof, at the end of the rear garden of the adjoining semi. However, the proposal would be seen from the upper floors of neighbouring dwellings. I have noted that permission was granted in recent years (4699/18) for a larger garden room at 36 Kings Avenue, a traditional dwelling nearby and also within the CA, which was also in a contemporary style with similar materials.
7. In the context of those approvals and the presence of contemporary additions to the appeal dwelling, the size, bulk, massing and materials of the proposal would not be uncharacteristic of outbuildings in the area and would sit comfortably within its large site, secluded from public views. As such, it would complement and preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would therefore accord with the development plan policies referred to earlier.
8. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in order to provide certainty. A condition requiring matching external materials is not necessary because materials details are specified in the application and are acceptable.
9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector