



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2022

By A. J. Boughton MA (IPSD) Dip.Arch. Dip.(Conservation) RIBA MRTPI
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/22/3300010

1 Hillview Road, Pinner, HA5 4PB

- 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 and Mrs R Kohli against the decision of The London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref: P/0456/22 dated 11 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is the installation of 2M high timber boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue:

2. The main issue is the effect of the perimeter timber fencing enclosing the southern side of 1 Hillview Road upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Procedural Matter:

3. The Council refer to the 'installation of 2m high timber boundary fence on the southern border of the site' which agrees with what appears on the submitted drawings identified as 'replacement fence'. This description relates to the timber boundary fencing (which in part sits on a pre-existing low brick wall) that encloses the garden area on the southern side of the appeal property but does not relate to the area of garden on its northern side which, therefore, I have not considered. The appeal relates to works already carried out and in the interests of clarity I have modified the description of development accordingly.

Reasons:

4. The appeal site is a large family dwelling in a wide plot which faces Hillview Road but is located at the junction with Grimsdyke Road in an area which has a peaceful suburban character with tree or hedge planting to most frontages.
5. The development is described as a 'replacement fence' but, noting this is a retrospective application I have limited information, other than drawing notes, as to the pre-existing condition or nature of the previous boundary treatment; this is suggested as having been some combination of hedging and fencing of unknown appearance with low brick walls that have been retained.
6. The fence construction on the Grimsdyke Road frontage is utilitarian in form with concrete posts and overly high timber infill creating an austere and

overbearing back-of-pavement line which contrasts with the generally softer and informal treatments of frontages to other properties. Where pre-existing brick walls have been raised to around 2m height with timber fencing on the Hillview Road frontage, the retention of what appears to be the original low brick boundary wall, which has a degree of visual interest appropriate to the wider environment, serves to emphasise the coarse and ill-considered appearance of the works which have been carried out and are the subject of this appeal. The prominent corner location increases the impact of these works which, cumulatively, detract from the character and appearance of the area.

7. Some screening from public view of outdoor amenity space of this large dwelling would be a reasonable expectation. In this case I note that the main living room appears to open out onto a large garden area on the northern side which is already enclosed and not, as my preliminary comments make clear, considered in this appeal. It appears that the southern garden area is accessed from within a recent single storey extension housing an ensuite bedroom. Whilst I note the appellants comments, no case has been made as to a special requirement for privacy in the area enclosed by the fencing which is the subject of this appeal. Even if there were such representations those requirements could be met by the well-considered use of planting or other measures to create privacy without causing visual harm to the street-scene.
8. I therefore give full weight to the conflict I have identified with Policy CS1.B of the Harrow Core Strategy 2012 (Core Strategy) and Policy DM1 of the Harrow Development Management Plan Local Policies (2013) (DMPLP) which seek a high standard of design and layout and to prevent development which is detrimental to local character and appearance. I conclude that, for the reasons given and taking all matters raised into account that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and that, in consequence, the appeal cannot succeed.

Andrew Boughton

INSPECTOR