



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022

by P B Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24TH May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/21/3288995

116 Beattyville Gardens, Barkingside, Ilford IG6 1JZ

- 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 Dr Ashan Sowdagar against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref 3642/21, dated 24 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a new boundary fence and new gates.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The Council has described the development as the erection of a front and side boundary brick wall with gates which more accurately describes the development. However, I note that part of the proposed front and side boundary treatment would consist of a wall with railings above.
2. At the time of my site visit a new wall and pillars were already in place and the front garden had been paved over to provide parking areas.

Decision

3. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect on (a) the character and appearance of the street scene and (b) the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, No. 114a Beattyville Gardens.

Reasons

5. The dwelling on the appeal site is a substantial two-storey detached property located at the end of a residential street. It occupies a corner site at the junction of Beattyville Gardens and Longwood Gardens, the latter being a reasonably busy road with residential and commercial properties nearby. There had previously been a low brick wall marking the front garden of the appeal site along the Beattyville Gardens frontage extending around the corner and along part of the Longwood Gardens frontage, the remainder being a high timber fence marking the rear garden.
6. Beattyville Gardens is wholly residential in character comprising older terraced dwellings. The road frontage within the vicinity of the site is predominantly characterised by a mixture of low brick walls with planting behind and wholly open frontages which have been hard surfaced to allow off street parking. That

part of Longwood Gardens that is within the immediate context of the appeal site is of similar character and appearance.

7. The proposal partly comprises a low brick wall with railings above interspersed with brick pillars to a total height of about 1.7 metres. It would extend along part of the Beattyville Gardens frontage turning the corner into Longwood Gardens extending up to the existing boundary feature marking the rear garden of the appeal property. The remainder of the Beattyville Gardens frontage would comprise two sliding gates of metal construction to match the appearance of the railings set between brick pillars to a similar overall height. The proposed wall which would be located along the majority of the boundary between the appeal site and the adjoining property, No. 114a Beattyville Gardens, would be just over two metres in height with a wall and railings towards the front.

Character and appearance

8. The proposed brick wall around the front garden of the property would be of relatively low height but the higher brick pillars with railings in between and adjoining gates would result in a boundary feature of significantly greater height than is generally characteristic of the immediate area in which the appeal site is located.
9. Whilst the railings would afford views through to the front of the appeal site, the overall visual impact would nevertheless be one of a relatively high and solid boundary feature. Furthermore, it would appear that the whole of the front garden area is to be hardstanding for parked cars with no planting or landscaping provided to soften the visual impact. Overall, this would result in the introduction of an incongruous feature at a very prominent corner location within the street scene which had previously been more open in character.
10. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. It would thereby conflict with Policy LP26 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 (2018) (LP) which seeks high quality design that respects local character and is well integrated with and complements the local area.
11. The Appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties within the wider area where front boundary enclosures of a similar height to that proposed have been built. However, none of these appear to be within the immediate context of the appeal site and the circumstances in which they were permitted is unclear. In my view they are not directly comparable with the appeal proposals which I have considered having regard to the particular characteristics of their context.
12. The Appellant also refers to permitted development rights that could enable the erection of a one metre high wall along the front boundary of the property extending around the corner. Whilst this could introduce a more solid feature, it would nevertheless be noticeably lower in height than the appeal proposal and would not in my opinion have the same harmful visual impact.

Living conditions

13. As noted above, the proposals include the erection of a wall of just over two metres height along the side garden boundary of the adjoining property, No. 114a Beattyville Road. This is to replace an existing two metre high fence.

14. Whilst noting that a brick wall would present a more solid appearance to the garden area of the adjoining property, I do not consider that it would be unacceptably more oppressive or overbearing than the existing fence which it would only marginally exceed in height. In addition, as noted by the Appellant, the fence could be replaced by a wall of the same height under permitted development rights in any event.
15. The occupiers of the adjoining property would have the opportunity to soften the appearance of the wall should they so wish. Overall, I find that their living conditions would not be harmed. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with LP Policy LP30 which seeks development that is well integrated with the local area and safeguards the amenity of nearby dwellings.

Conclusions

16. Overall, whilst the proposal would be acceptable in respect of the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property, it would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, resulting in conflict with the development plan overall. I have noted the concerns of the Appellant with regard to the need to maintain the security of the appeal property following recent theft of property and vehicles. However, I am not convinced that the appeal proposal is the only means whereby such security can be provided and this factor is not sufficient to outweigh this conflict.
17. I therefore conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

P Jarvis

INSPECTOR