

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2023

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/23/3325653

11 Rose Tree Mews, Woodford Green, Essex IG8 8GJ

- 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 Shaun Mcenery against the decision of the London Borough of Redbridge Council.
 - The application Ref 3179/22, dated 25 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a garden boundary wall and rear shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The planning application form, the subject of this appeal, set out a detailed explanation of the proposed works and their justification. I have taken this into account, however in the interest of brevity, I have utilised the Council's description as taken from their decision notice. Furthermore, I noted on my site visit that the wall and shed were substantially complete and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Woodford Bridge Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a bungalow located at the northern end of a cul-de-sac within a modern mews development which is behind more historic development fronting Chigwell Road. I understand that the Conservation Area covers the historic hamlet of Woodford Bridge and is centred on the former green located along Chigwell Road which adds to the area's high quality.
5. The boundary for the Conservation Area is contiguous with the appeal site's north eastern and north western boundaries. Beyond (and to the west of) this is a residential street known as Purleigh Avenue which comprises a mix of two storey housing, as well as 2no blocks of three storey flats. Immediately to the rear of the appeal site is a block of flat roof garages accessed via a cul-de-sac and over which are clear views of the proposed development.

6. The subject dwelling has a side garden gate to its north eastern side along the boundary for which has been erected the painted rendered wall which is only apparent to a minimal degree from the front of the site. Going from the submissions before me, the garden environment that has been created by the appellant is of a high quality, unfortunately however, the same cannot be said for the outward facing elevations of the scheme, and in particular that of the aforementioned shed.
7. I noted on my site visit that the shed and the external (north west facing) elevation of the wall along the rear garden boundary has been painted an 'off white' colour which renders it stark in appearance, far more so than the warmer terracotta hue of the internal elevations. The quality of the rendering is poor and the fascia detailing comprising white and erroneously broken white uPVC cladding detracts from views into the Conservation Area.
8. Whilst I can fully understand the appellant's reasoning for replacing the previous fencing and providing a robust form of construction, very little sympathy has been paid to the historic nature of the appeal site's setting. I note the examples of outbuildings within other rear gardens closeby, however ultimately each case must be assessed on its own merits and I find that the appeal proposal is not directly comparable to those in any case.
9. Notwithstanding the appellant's claims that high quality materials have been employed, I cannot agree with that stance. I find that the proposal gives rise to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset and its setting. I note the other benefits cited by the appellant in respect of the scheme with regard to surface water run-off, greater security, as well as preventing foxes from accessing the site, however these do not amount to public benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm.
10. Therefore, I find that the proposal fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the scheme is contrary to policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and policies LP26 and LP33 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015 – 2030 in that the proposal fails to respect, enhance and utilise the heritage asset or be of high quality with architecture that pays attention to detail, with the proposal harming the significance of the heritage asset.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR