



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2025

by Thomas Shields DipURP MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/C/23/3334625

106 Greenford Avenue, Hanwell, London, W7 3QS

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by MS Susan Sarmiento against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The notice was issued on 17 November 2023.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, the erection of grey coloured fence panels and posts to the front of the property.
 - The requirements of the notice are:
 1. Remove all the grey coloured fence panels and posts to the front of the property, visible on the attached photographs, numbered 1, 2 and 3.
 2. Remove all resultant debris.
 - The periods for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are (i) the effect of the fence panels on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area, and (ii) the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. 106 Greenford Avenue is a two-storey house of traditional brick and tile construction with projecting gable in a small terrace of houses on the western side of Greenford Avenue, a busy suburban residential street in Hanwell. The character of the surrounding area is mainly residential with similar semi-detached and terraced houses, uniformly set back from the pavement with front gardens or forecourts having low walls and gates. A bus stop and shelter are located on the pavement directly in front of the property.
4. The existing 1m high brick front walls to the front and one side boundary of No. 106 have been topped with grey composite fence panels and posts. On the other side boundary the wall has been removed and replaced with a full height fence in the same grey panels and posts. The total height of the new or extended front and side boundaries is approximately 1.85m to 2m.
5. Due to their materials, colour and overall height the panels dominate the front aspect of the property and are highly incongruous with the traditional character

and appearance of the area I have described. I have considered whether imposing planning conditions, for example requiring painting, could adequately mitigate their significantly harmful effect, but conclude that no conditions would adequately do so.

6. The host property and the adjoining two properties either side have vehicular access from their forecourts onto the highway. However, the visibility for drivers leaving the properties is now significantly reduced due to the full height of the panels cutting across sight lines where the boundaries meet the back edge of the pavement. Frequency of pedestrian movement past these three driveways is significant along the pavement at this point given the location of the bus shelter. As such, I consider the risk arising from the increased height of the boundaries to pedestrians is unacceptable.
7. I appreciate the panels were installed to afford some extra privacy, given the regular stopping of buses outside of the property, and to discourage anti-social behaviour. However, there are other simpler methods of improving privacy within the front rooms of the house and of discouraging anti-social behaviour, and there is no evidence before me that alternatives have been explored.
8. I conclude that the development results in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and unacceptably increases the risk to highway safety in conflict with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021 and policies 7.4 and 7B of Ealing's Development Management Development Plan Document 2013.
9. For these reasons the appeal must be dismissed.

Thomas Shields

INSPECTOR