



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/D/25/3368308

45 Mighell Avenue, Ilford IG4 5JW

- 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 Ms Abi Falana against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application ref is 0292/25.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retention of boundary wall.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appeal follows an application seeking retention of development which has already been carried out. Indeed, I saw the wall in situ on my site visit and have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - a) the character and appearance of the area; and
 - b) the living conditions of occupiers of 46 and 48 Fowey Avenue (Nos 46 and 48), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site relates to a two-storey detached building, which houses two dwellings. The site is situated on a significant bend on Mighell Avenue, giving the appearance of a corner plot. There is a high wall to the boundary with the street with brick-built piers and central panels with a herringbone design in matching brick and stone copings to the top. This adjoins a high white painted rendered wall to the street boundary of no.52 Fowey Avenue. In contrast, boundary treatments within rear gardens in the area more often comprise of fencing or vegetation which together with outbuildings are typical of the rear garden environment at this location.

6. Due to its mainly breeze block composition, combined with its substantial width and height, the wall appears as a visually dominant and incongruous feature amongst rear gardens. Moreover, it appears noticeably taller than the brick wall to the street boundary at no.45, also markedly contrasting with its design and materials. This further emphasises the poorly conceived scale and design of the proposal and its lack of harmony with the surrounding area.
7. I acknowledge that there are outbuildings serving neighbouring properties alongside the wall and that in some cases they are of a similar height. However, there are occasional gaps between them, and they have an overtly domestic character. They are not comparable to the stark appearance of the wall.
8. I conclude that the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area and thus does not comply with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the Redbridge Local Plan (2018) (LP) which together require that development is of a high design quality, is well integrated and maintains or improves the appearance of the locality. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 135 which requires that developments add to the overall quality of the area and be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

9. Whilst the wall spans the rear boundary of several rear gardens on Fowey Avenue, some of these properties have large outbuildings which substantively screen the wall in those instances. The wall is most visible from within Nos 46 and 48 as those particular properties have smaller outbuildings alongside the boundary.
10. The adjoining properties on Fowey Avenue are situated at a slightly higher level to the appeal site. The respective ground levels, together with the intervening space between the wall and the rear windows and more immediate garden areas to the rear of the dwellings at Nos 46 and 48, ensure that the wall does not unacceptably enclose outlook when experienced from those particular properties.
11. Thus, the development has an acceptable relationship with the living conditions of occupiers of 46 and 48 Fowey Avenue, with particular regard to outlook. In that regard, it complies with Policies LP26 and LP30 of the LP insofar as they require that development provides for an acceptable outlook from surrounding dwellings.

Other Matters

12. The appellant points out that there are no heritage designations to consider in this instance. However, this is not a reason to allow a development which is in any case harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Moreover, whilst I acknowledge the appellant's intention to dissuade antisocial behaviour and provide increased security, there is nothing to suggest that this could not be achieved through a scheme which is less harmful in character and appearance terms.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. I have found that the development has an acceptable relationship with the living conditions of neighbouring properties. However, the harm to the character and appearance of the area is significant and for this reason, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR