



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2024

by Penelope Metcalfe BA(Hons) MSc DipUP DipDBE MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3338218

92 Stafford Road, Ruislip, Hillingdon, HA4 6PF

- 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 Mrs Asia Hossein against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 78128/APP/2023/2943, dated 10 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 4 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of new front boundary wall and amendments to existing boundary wall to the side and rear of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of the development as set out in the planning application was in narrative form. I consider that the description in the Council's decision notice as set out in the banner heading above is more concise and is an accurate description of the proposal. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue in this case is its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. 92 Stafford Road is a two storey end of terrace house set at an angle at the junction of Stafford Road and Trevor Crescent in an established residential area. It has a relatively large side and rear garden due to its location on a corner.
5. The relevant policies in this case include policies BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012) and DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (January 2020) (the local plan). These relate to the design quality of new development and its impact on the public realm. The materials and height of any front boundary must be in keeping with the character of the area.
6. There is an existing rendered brick wall approximately 1.85m high along part of the north boundary of the site adjacent to the road which was constructed

following vehicle damage to the previous wall. The proposal is to reduce the height of this by approximately 75mm and remove the render.

7. I consider that the height and materials of this wall along the boundary with Stafford Road are out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I understand the appellant's concerns regarding the safety of her family due to the exposure on this corner site. However, the site is large compared to the majority of the surrounding properties and there is still a good sized rear garden which appears to be secure since it is already enclosed by a high brick wall and fencing. Although the removal of the rendering would improve the appearance of the wall, I consider that it would still be too high in the context of the surrounding low walls and hedges.
8. The predominant character of the surrounding area is one where boundaries with the road are typically marked by low walls and hedges which contribute to an attractive townscape. There are very few properties in the immediate surroundings which are similarly sited on corners. An exception to this is No. 96 at the other end of the terrace, which has a similarly sized plot to the side and rear. The boundary here with Trevor Crescent comprises a high timber fence which appears to have been in place for some time, and together with a garage provides enclosure for the rear garden. This is not wholly in keeping with the surroundings and although it appears less intrusive than the wall at the appeal site, I consider that it does not weigh in favour of the appeal.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to local plan policies BE1, DMHB11, DMHB12 and DMHD1.
10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

PAG Metcalfe

INSPECTOR