



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2026

by Andrew Walker MSc BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) BA PgDip MCIEH CEnvH JP
an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/C/24/3338511
66 Lampton Road, Hounslow, TW3 4DJ

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compensation Act 1991.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Kabir Alag against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The enforcement notice, Ref GEN/2021/00031 was issued on 11 January 2024.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is: Without planning permission, the unauthorised erection of a front boundary wall and pillars.
 - The requirements of the notice are to:
 - i. Demolish the front boundary treatment cross hatched in black on the plan.
 - ii. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is 3 months.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (a) (f) (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended (the Act). Since the appeal on ground (a) has been made, the application for planning permission deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act as amended falls to be considered.
-

Decision

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

Ground (a) and the deemed planning application

Main Issues

2. The main planning issues in the appeal are the effect of the development upon:
 - highway safety; and
 - the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

Highway safety

3. While I acknowledge that the turning area at the appeal property encourages egress in forward rather than reverse gear, the tall brick pillars and walls (of around 2m in height) on the boundary either side of the property's exits result in very limited visibility splays onto the highway. The result poses an unacceptable risk users of the highway – and particularly to pedestrians on this seemingly well-trodden route to and from Central Hounslow, notwithstanding the appellant's assertion that no accidents (or complaints) have yet occurred.
4. I do not accept that the risk would be the same were a boundary treatment in place fronting the highway under permitted development rights, as it would necessarily be lower (maximum 1m) and visibility splays would be greater.

5. I have considered what the appellant has said about the previous boundary treatment, including the overgrown high privet hedge, but that does not affect my finding on the unacceptable risk to highway safety caused by the current development. Nor does it matter what is occurring elsewhere in this regard.
6. For these reasons, the development prejudices the safety of highway (including pedestrian) users due to insufficient visibility. As such, it is conflict with Policy EC2 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP) supported by the Council's Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (2016).

Character and appearance

7. Notwithstanding some local examples to the contrary, the prevailing character of this part of Lampton Road is largely one of fairly open front boundaries consisting of low walls, pillars and railings. The appeal development, on the other hand, incongruously dominates the streetscene through its heavy and relatively enclosing appearance arising from the combined height and bulk of its extensive brickwork¹.
8. Even were these design and dimensional issues not significantly harmful in themselves, the choice of grey bricks is jarringly and deleteriously in contrast with nearby built form including the materials of the host dwelling (which, contrary to the appellant's argument, is not so distant from the development so as to attenuate the adverse juxtaposition).
9. For these reasons, the appeal development significantly harms the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such, it is contrary to Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 of the LP as supported by the Council's Residential Extension Guidelines (2017) which together seek to protect character and appearance. For the same reasons it is in conflict with the design principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

8. The appellant says that the development provides numerous benefits, including:
 - prevention and reduction of rubbish deposited in the front garden (and in the previous poor-condition hedge) associated with pedestrian traffic;
 - improved security and reduction in vandalism;
 - reduction in fumes and noise, particularly as the highway is used by high levels of commercial traffic; and
 - increased privacy.
10. While I afford these benefits moderate weight, they do not outweigh the policy conflict and significant harm I have identified.

Planning Conclusion

11. The front boundary walls and pillars do not accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations which outweigh that finding. There are no planning conditions which would make the development acceptable, and I will accordingly not grant planning permission. Ground (a) does not succeed.

¹ Contrary to as suggested, the brickwork is notably taller and more substantial than that of next door (No 68).

Ground (f)

12. For an appeal to succeed on this ground, I must be satisfied that the requirements of the notice are excessive in achieving its purpose.
13. It seems to me from the way the notice has been drafted that its purpose is to remedy the breach of planning control by restoring the land to its condition before the breach took place. It does that by requiring the demolition of the unauthorised development and the removal of resultant materials. There is nothing illegitimate, excessive or unreasonable in those requirements.
14. Even were the purpose of the notice to remedy harm to amenity, the reduction of the height of the walls and pillars to no more than 1m (as suggested by the appellant while pointing to permitted development rights²) would still cause unacceptable harm through the poor choice of grey bricks - which would remain strikingly alien within the context.
15. Accordingly, ground (f) does not succeed.

Ground (g)

16. For success on this ground, I must be satisfied that the 3 month compliance period of the notice falls short of reasonable.
17. The appellant requires 12 months (as stated in his final comments), but has provided very limited evidence to persuade me that the work (both steps of the notice) cannot reasonably be completed within 3 months even with the commensurate care being needed to demolish the substantial brick structure.
18. Therefore, ground (g) does not succeed.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above, I consider that the appeal should not succeed. I uphold the enforcement notice.

Andrew Walker

INSPECTOR

² While also bearing in mind that the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 does not does grant retrospective permission.