



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3370888**

**30 Glengall Road, Woodford Green IG8 0DL**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr Adam Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
  - The application Ref is 1299/25.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as “alterations to existing outbuilding - extension of side and alterations to the roof”.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission has been refused due to the absence of an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on nearby trees. Whilst the appeal is accompanied by a plan showing the location and species of trees close the proposed development, a full AIA prepared by a qualified arboriculturalist is not before me.

### Main Issue

3. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the health and life expectancy of nearby trees and on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large detached 2-storey house that occupies a relatively wide plot with the majority of the garden space being to the side. The site is bounded to the side by the driveway into Woodford Green Preparatory School. Next to this boundary there is a long narrow detached garage with a pitched roof and hardstanding at the front. There is a small pine tree to the rear of this outbuilding and mature shrubs along the side facing the house. Close to the front boundary of the site there is a mature Laurel tree. This is a prominent feature in the street scene that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would comprise works to the outbuilding to make it wider. The side wall closest to the house would be demolished and a new side wall constructed nearer to the house. A taller pitched roof would be erected to span the increased width of the building. These works would require the removal of the pine tree at the

rear and the mature shrubs along the side of the garage. I am satisfied that these works would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

6. The mature Laurel tree is a short distance from the garage. Based on my observations and the limited information available to me I consider there to be a high likelihood that the Root Protection Area (RPA) of this tree extends to the garage and to the area to the side of it where the extension is proposed to be erected. The proposal would therefore most likely require excavation works and associated construction activity within the RPA leading to potential harm to the health and life expectancy of the Laurel tree. In the absence of an AIA I am not assured that adequate mitigation measures could be put in place to overcome such harm.
7. For these reasons I conclude that, based on the limited information available to me, the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the health and life expectancy of the Laurel tree and on the character and appearance of the area. As such it fails to accord with Policy LP38 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) and Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021) which support the retention of existing trees which are of value and make a positive contribution.

### **Other Matters**

8. The appellant's grounds of appeal suggest that the Council did not explicitly request an AIA during the processing of the planning application. This is unfortunate but may have been averted had the question in respect of trees and hedges on the planning application form been answered correctly. The Council's failure to request an AIA does not overcome the harm identified above.
9. The grounds of appeal suggest that an AIA is only required where "*proposed works could directly affect a significant number of trees*". The Council's planning application validation requirements in fact require AIAs "*where trees within or adjacent to the site may be affected by the development*" and note that this information should be prepared by a qualified arboriculturalist to British Standard BS 5837:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

*S Poole*

INSPECTOR