



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

by E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W5780/W/25/3370848

45 Mayfair Gardens, Woodford Green IG8 9AB

- 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 J Sanger against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Redbridge.
 - The application Ref is 1364/25.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as “rear detached games room structure”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, some construction work had been undertaken. Regardless of what has been constructed to date, my assessment is based on the plans before me.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including its effect on trees.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is located within a residential area characterised by detached and semi-detached properties with verdant rear gardens, some of which include outbuildings. There is a mature tree within the garden of the appeal property and mature trees are also present in gardens located immediately to the north.
5. The appeal proposal is for an outbuilding in the rear garden which would have a maximum height of 3.8m. The height would be substantially taller than the existing boundary fencing and the outbuilding would, therefore, appear prominent from the rear gardens of adjacent properties. In this regard, by reason of its height, the outbuilding would appear out of proportion with the host dwelling and incongruous in its surroundings.
6. I am aware that the appellant has designed the proposed development so as to screen from view the outbuilding located at the rear of the garden of 26 Horn Lane. I observed on site that, due to level differences, this outbuilding is visible from the appeal property. Nevertheless, I have reasoned above why the proposed development would be harmful. Ultimately, the presence of a taller structure to the

rear and the appellant's desire to screen this from view does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

7. I observed on site that trees located in relatively close proximity to the proposed development, including the mature tree on the appeal site and the mature trees in gardens to the north, contribute positively to the verdant nature of the area. Consequently, any loss resulting from the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the trees remain in place even though construction work has started. However, without the benefit of appropriate evidence, such as an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, I cannot be sure that the trees would likely survive in a healthy condition in the long-term. In the context of a potential harmful impact, I consider that sufficient information should be presented in advance of a decision being made. In the absence of this, I have insufficient information before me to conclude that harm can be ruled out.
9. Taking account of the above, and in taking a precautionary approach with regard to trees, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including on trees. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to the relevant provisions of Policies LP26, LP30 and LP38 of the Redbridge Local Plan 2015-2030 and Policy G7 of the London Plan 2021. Amongst other matters, these policies seek development which makes a positive architectural and urban design contribution to its context and location, complements the character of existing buildings, is subordinate in terms of size, scale and height and retains where possible trees of value.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR