The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

**by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 3 May 2017**

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/17/3169374**
**9 Truesdale Drive, Harefield, Middx UB9 6AY**

- 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 B Gill against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref 4749/APP/2016/4317, dated 27 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
- The development proposed is the erection of front boundary wall with piers, railings and gates up to a maximum height of 1.5m.

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matter

2. The development has already been started and the walls and piers were present on the site at the time of my visit.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal relates to this 2 storey semi-detached house which is located in a residential area comprising of similar properties. The original houses are quite modest in size, although a number have been extended, with gaps to the sides and relatively generous front garden areas. Whilst the appellant describes the front gardens as modest, I consider that their width and depth, when compared to the size of the dwellings, gives a generous sense of space. This is complemented by the relatively wide grass verges.

5. At my visit I noted a variety of boundary treatment to these properties, consisting of wooden fences, chain-link fencing, walls and hedges. In general these were of a relatively modest height and of an informal design. Although there were a small number of exceptions, I consider that the overriding impression is one of relative openness and informality giving a sense of space to the front of these properties and those on the neighbouring streets that I was asked to look at.

6. The height and design of the proposal would result in a formal appearance and one which would have a considerable visual presence in the street-scene. In my judgement it would appear dominating and over-formal within this context of less substantial and informal front boundaries. In this way the proposal would fail to harmonise with the prevailing character of the area and would have a harmful effect. I have taken account of the other forms of boundaries which have been pointed out by the appellant but my view is that the overall character of the area is as I describe and that the exceptions do not conform with this character and they reinforce my view of the harmful effects that such features can have on the area.

**Conclusions**

7. I have concluded that the proposal would fail to harmonise with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and would have a harmful effect on it. Accordingly, I find that the proposal is contrary to Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1-Strategic Policies, Policies BE13 and BE19 of Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies and the advice in the Hillingdon Design and Access Statement, Residential Extensions SPD. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*S T Wood*

INSPECTOR