



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by V Bond LLB (Hons) Solicitor (Non-Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 DECEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/C/24/3339495

10 Townfield Road, Hayes, Middlesex UB3 2EL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Preet Sedana against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The notice was issued on 16 January 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of front/side boundary brick wall, incorporating metal railings and entrance gate (shown as green line in the approximate position on the site plan) ("the breach").
 - The requirements of the notice are: (i) Demolish and remove the front and side boundary brick wall, incorporating metal railings and entrance gate shown in the approximate position of green line on the site plan) (ii) Remove from the land all debris, items, fixtures and fittings, plant and machinery resulting from compliance with points (i) above.
 - The period for compliance with the requirement is: Three (3) calendar months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f) and (g) 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 allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the 1990 Act (as amended) for the development already carried out, namely the erection of front/side boundary brick wall, incorporating metal railings and entrance gate as shown on the plan attached to the notice.

The appeal on ground (a) and the deemed planning application (DPA)

Preliminary Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework 2024 came into force during the course of the appeal. The revisions made have not had a direct bearing on the issues which are central to this appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the street and area.

Reasons

4. The host property is an end of terrace dwelling on a corner plot at the junction of Townfield Road with Fifth Avenue. Along Townfield Road and within the surrounding area, a number of dwellings have low front boundary treatments or hedging. There is though significant variety in the design and form of built enclosures and there are examples of higher front walling incorporating railings on

corner properties close to the appeal site. The community centre opposite the appeal property is also enclosed by relatively tall walling with railings and metal fencing.

5. The appeal development is a front and side boundary wall which incorporates metal railings and gating. It fronts the pavement and uses external materials which complement the dwelling's external finish. The longer front section of the boundary enclosures erected is not significantly taller than front fencing and walling associated with the adjoining terraced properties and the taller side section is seen in the context of a Fifth Avenue garage structure. The spacing in the design of the railings and gating also reduces the appearance of massing. As such, and given the variations in front boundary treatments in the immediate area, the appeal development does not appear overbearing or visually intrusive.
6. While I acknowledge that other higher boundary enclosures may pre-date current development plan policy, nonetheless these do form part of the character of the surrounding area. Landscaped front gardens do create pleasing relief from built form but given available permitted development rights to erect a built form of boundary enclosure, loss of hedging cannot weigh significantly against the appeal development.
7. I find then that the appeal development does not result in any material harm to the character and appearance of the street and area. It accords in this way with Policy DMHB 11 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two - Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies (2012) which indicate that all development should incorporate principles of good design, harmonising with local context including by considering the height, mass and bulk of adjacent structures and be designed to be appropriate to the identity and context of the area.

Conclusion on ground (a) and the DPA

8. For the above reasons, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal development preserves the character and appearance of the street and area and accords with the development plan, read as a whole. No material considerations indicate a decision other than in accordance with the plan. Since the development has already been carried out, no commencement condition is required and no other conditions are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the operations as described in the notice. The enforcement notice will be quashed.
10. In these circumstances the appeals on grounds (f) and (g) do not fall to be considered.

V Bond

INSPECTOR