
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2025

by **C Hall BSc MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3363655

37 Hereford Road, Wanstead, Redbridge E11 2EA

- 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 Richard Mendonca against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application ref. Is 0346/25.
 - The development proposed is for the formation of means of access onto Hereford Road. Partial demolition of front boundary wall and new hard standing area. Remove existing dropped kerb on Buckingham Road, and reinstate kerb. Installation of a vehicle electric charging point.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of means of access onto Hereford Road. Partial demolition of front boundary wall and new hard standing area. Remove existing dropped kerb on Buckingham Road, and reinstate kerb. Installation of a vehicle electric charging point at 37 Hereford Road, Wanstead, Redbridge E11 2EA in accordance with the terms of the application ref. 0346/25, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2406-0271-02B, 2406-0271-04B.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the Wanstead Grove Conservation Area (CA); and b) highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling on the corner of Hereford Road and Buckingham Road in a predominantly residential neighbourhood. The street scene is broadly characterised by properties of similar scale, albeit with differing design features and external materials.
 4. The special architectural and historic interest of the CA derives from the well-preserved area of late Victorian and Edwardian suburban housing that represents an important stage in the development of Wanstead from a country village to a middle-class London suburb. Being situated in the CA, I have applied the statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA by attaching considerable importance and weight to that desirability.
-

5. I note the Council's concerns in respect of the loss of front boundary walls; those that have been retained in the CA provide a sense of enclosure between the public domain and private curtilages, contributing to visual amenity and reflecting the historic layout of the neighbourhood.
6. Nonetheless, whilst the removal of a section of the boundary wall and garden is regrettable, a majority of wall and garden would still be retained elsewhere on the appeal site's borders with the public highway. Consequently, the attractive appearance and distinctive character of the property would not be significantly diminished.
7. The introduction of a parked car to the front of the property would also result in some change. However, it would be sited to one side of the frontage only, and as such would not in my view have a harmful impact, particularly in the context of the established street scene. I consider that the remaining garden area would continue to make a significant contribution to the homogenous character of the CA. Therefore, taking account of the overall setting, I find that the scheme would not be so deleterious as to warrant a refusal of permission on this ground.
8. I conclude on this matter that the proposal would not have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounds, including the CA. It would conform with Policies LP26 and LP33 of the Local Plan and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LonP), which seek to ensure proposals relate to surrounding development, meet high standards of design, and protect the character of conservation areas. The appeal scheme would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that good design is a key aspect of sustainability and requires new development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

Highway safety

9. The Council argues that the scheme raises concerns given the close proximity to the junction between Hereford Road and Buckingham Road and the impact on the pedestrian crossing point, which could cause a highway hazard due to manoeuvres on and off the highway. I appreciate that a vehicle emerging from the driveway near to the pedestrian crossing point is an obvious safety threat.
10. However, I observed that visibility along the pavements at and around the junction is clear. Furthermore, vehicular manoeuvres into and out of domestic accesses are a feature along local roads, with these being infrequent, of short duration and generally approached at low speed. The prospect of reversing to and from the appeal site would therefore be little different to the existing situation concerning other properties elsewhere, and there is no indication that any incidents have arisen due to conflict between pedestrians and vehicles in the neighbourhood.
11. The dwelling would be provided with a maximum of one off-street parking space as a result of the proposal; the appellant states that the existing detached garage at the rear of the site has been converted. The reinstatement of the footway at this point would also allow for additional on-street parking.
12. In the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, I am therefore drawn to conclude that the development would not have a detrimental impact on highway safety. It would comply with Policies T2 and T4 of the LonP and the Redbridge Footway Crossing Policy as far as they relate to reducing road danger and improving street safety, comfort, convenience and amenity.

Conditions

13. I have considered the imposition of conditions in light of advice in Planning Policy Guidance and the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, the approved plans are listed for certainty.

Conclusion

14. With respect to the arguments above and all other matters, I allow the appeal.

C Hall

INSPECTOR