
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3369079

7 Niagara Avenue, Ealing W5 4UD

- 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 Ms Indira Bhamra against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 250172HH.
 - The development proposed is retrospective erection of a side boundary wall in the front driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the side boundary wall in question has already been constructed. The appeal is therefore considered retrospectively.
3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The site comprises a semi-detached 2-storey traditional dwelling located along a residential cul-de-sac. The street is linear, with the road flanked by pairs of semi-detached houses and short terraces. Dwellings are set back from the footpath behind modest front gardens or driveways. Brick and render are materials that are used heavily both in the dwellings themselves and their boundary enclosures.
5. Several properties along this side of the street, including the appeal site, have had the traditional front garden space replaced by hard surfacing and the front boundary wall removed to accommodate car parking. Nevertheless, walls enclosing front gardens and driveways typically remain relatively low, permitting views across frontages and allowing soft landscaping in front gardens to punctuate the street scene. Along with the pleasant tree lined nature of the street, this contributes to its verdant appearance and somewhat open character.
6. The Ealing Design Guidance Part B housing design guidance November 2022 advises that front boundary treatments should be maintained wherever possible, either through hedging, railings or brick walls. It stipulates that natural boundary treatments such as privet hedges should be prioritised over brick or metal railings.
7. The appeal development is a tall red brick wall along the side boundary of the appeal site. This has created a significant visual barrier, curtailing views down the street, eroding the sense of openness and blocking out soft landscaping. Though

red brick is common in this area, it is typically used at lower levels as a boundary enclosure. The height and finish of the brick wall sit in stark contrast against the white render of the host dwelling. Its obtrusive size and incongruous appearance therefore detract from the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

8. There are some examples of tall boundary walls to the front of dwellings in the vicinity of the site. The full circumstances of those referred to in the evidence are not before me. Nevertheless, each sits in a different context, with walls at No 11 and No 15 of considerable age and flanking an infill development. 302 Northfields Avenue and 2 Blondin Avenue are end terraces, with the higher walls adjacent to a footpath or alleyway. These examples do not contribute to the prevailing character and appearance of the area and do not provide justification for the harm identified.
9. The development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. It is contrary to Policy D4 of the London Plan March 2021 and Policy 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document Adopted 10 December 2013. These policies seek to ensure that development delivers good design, and in Ealing's existing built areas complements the street sequence, building pattern, scale, materials and detailing.

Other Matters

10. I have had due regard to the appellant's personal circumstances and the effect their ongoing participation in the planning process has on their health and wellbeing. However, dismissal of the appeal would be in accordance with the law and in pursuance of the protection of the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area in the public interest. Given the identified harm and development plan conflict, this would be proportionate and necessary in this case.
11. The appellant's frustrations with the advice provided by the Council are noted. However, I must determine the appeal based on the development before me, with regard to the policies of the development plan. This therefore cannot lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.
12. Other than where set out above, I have not identified conflict with any other relevant parts of the development plan or national policy and guidance. However, the absence of harm or development plan conflict with respect to other relevant matters weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
13. I recognise the appellant's willingness to resolve concerns regarding the impact of the development however there is no amended proposal before me. In any event, the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme. It is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the LPA and by interested parties at the application stage.

Conclusion

14. The development conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. I have found no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR