
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/21/3281811

5 Linksway, Northwood HA6 2XA

- 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 Mr Lakhani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 31595/APP/2021/1761, dated 30 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of gates, brick piers & railings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the erection of gates, brick piers & railings at 5 Linksway, Northwood HA6 2XA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 31595/APP/2021/1761 dated 30 April 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1073/P/1A, 1073/P/2 & 1073/P/3.

Procedural Matters

2. I noted on my site visit that some fence posts had been erected along the line of the boundary treatment which would be provided under this proposal.
3. However, those fence posts had a greater height than the railings shown on the proposed plans and there is nothing to indicate that the development that has commenced is the same as which has been applied for under this scheme.
4. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt.
5. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on that basis. I acknowledge that the proposals relate to the front of the site.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The character of the area is defined by large, detached dwellings sitting on large plots within an attractive verdant and mature setting. The site falls within the Copsewood Estate Area of Special Local Character (ASLC). The gates, brick piers & railings would be provided across the front boundary of 5 Linksway, which itself is a large detached residential dwelling.
8. Linksway exhibits a wide variety of front boundary treatments towards its northern end. Some front gardens are largely open to the street, while others are enclosed by thick hedges and sturdy gates. The use of robust timber fencing can be seen along with the use of brick walls and railings.
9. It is possible that front boundaries within the area were once more commonly open, perhaps in line with the original design aspirations of the estate. However, regardless of this, there is now such a wide variety of front boundary treatment, that no particular type dominates or provides any definitive contribution to the character of this part of the ASLC.
10. Within this context, the proposed boundary treatment would not appear out of place. The use of railings would allow the vegetation behind within the front garden to remain visible and the proposal would not therefore be to the detriment of the verdant appearance of the area.
11. There would therefore be no adverse impact on the character or appearance of the area. The proposal would subsequently accord with policies BE1 and HE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan Part 1 Strategic Policies (2012), policies DMHB 1, DMHB 5, DMHB 6, DMHB 11, DMHB 12, DMHB 14 and DMHD 1 of the Local Plan Part 2 Development Management Policies (2020) and Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021). Amongst other things these policies seek high quality development that is appropriate to the character of an area and which protects the historic environment.

Conditions

12. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. I have identified no conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

TJ Burnham

INSPECTOR