



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/20/3246952

20 Daymer Gardens, Eastcote, Pinner HA5 2HP

- 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 [REDACTED] against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 26088/APP/2019/2782, dated 20 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Retrospective planning for the addition of garden trellis with artificial hedging to existing fencing and side and rear of garage. The trellis has been erected up to maintain and respect our right to privacy. Our property is situated on lower ground, 0.7m dip from the road and pavement level thereby heavily exposed. The houses opposite have a clear view into the side and rear of our garden due to the raised slopes of their properties from the road. The side of the house and garden are fully exposed with the current fence to passer-by pedestrians on the pavement and those on the road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For clarity and precision, I have inserted 'Pinner' in the address in the banner heading, as it is listed on the appeal form and Council's decision notice.
3. At the time of my site visit, it was apparent that the only element of the appeal scheme on site was the section between the host dwelling and No 22 Daymer Gardens. The appellant has confirmed that he only intends to re-erect a section of the scheme to the rear of the garage once the construction works currently being undertaken at the site is at a stage that allows its installation. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
4. Since the Council made its decision on the planning application, which is subject of this appeal, on 16 January 2020 the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (LP2) was adopted. Consequently, the 'saved' policies contained within the Council's Unitary Development Plan have been superseded and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions has been withdrawn. I am required to determine this appeal on the basis of the development plan which is in force at the time of my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue of this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a detached house constructed out brick, with render on the ground floor elevations and a fully hipped roof. The surrounding houses are similar in design to the host dwelling with areas of grass and mature trees interspersed throughout the development. This forms a strong, positive and green characteristic in the street scene.
7. Due to the open nature of the site and Daymer Gardens, along with the changing levels due to the topography, the site is prominent and clearly visible from the street. Whilst only a small section of the scheme was present on site at the time of my visit, it was evident that the artificial hedgerow (the hedgerow) above the fencing was an unsuitable material in this residential location. The hedgerow detracts from the natural elements that currently form the wider residential development.
8. Thus, I consider the hedgerow to form an incongruous feature, resulting in a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property that is readily visible in the street scene. Whilst the extent of the scheme has been reduced since the submission of the appeal, I am far from convinced that the harmful visual effect would not be intensified if the additional section were to be re-erected.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the development significantly harms the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This is contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (November 2012), LP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHD 1. The proposal would also be contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matter

10. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including his need to increase privacy for his family home, but on the evidence before me this is not a reason to grant permission in the face of the harm identified. I have considered this appeal scheme on its own particular merits and concluded that it causes harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

11. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR