



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

by O Tresise MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/D/24/3350588**

**1 The Croft, Ruislip, Hillingdon, Middlesex, HA4 0SF**

- 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 Mr Shamsul Islam against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
- The application Ref is 629/APP/2024/965.  
The development proposed is described as: 'Raising of piers 4-11 & infilling with black open grills along with sliding security gates.'

---

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. At my site visit I saw that development has commenced. However, my decision is based on the information provided.
3. Since the appeal was lodged, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been updated. However, I am satisfied that there are no changes of any consequence for the main issue in this appeal.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. Policy DMHD 1 section F (ii) of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 2 – Development Management Policies January 2020 (the DMP) states 'the design, materials and height of any front boundary must be in keeping with the character of the area to ensure harmonisation with the existing street scene'.
6. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling prominently sited on a corner. Dwellings in the area are set back from the road behind front gardens, some of which provide off-street parking. With the exception of some high close-boarded fences, boundary treatments are either open to the street, or they consist of low brick walls, softened by planting, with higher brick walls on flank elevations. This arrangement contributes to a generally open character in the area.

7. The proposal seeks to increase the height of the piers of the low brick boundary wall, infill the gaps between the piers with black grills and install sliding security gates. Whilst the piers would be constructed in brick, the height of the piers would be considerably higher than other front brick boundary walls in the area. The appellant describes the grills as 'open', such that they would allow views into and out of the appeal site. But this is not what is shown by the drawings provided to describe the appeal development. These drawings show the sections between the piers would be solid, as would the proposed gates. Overall, the proposed arrangement would be uncharacteristic and incongruous.
8. I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not comply with Policy BE1 of the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part 1 – Strategic Policies November 2012, Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHD 1 of the DMP or Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021. Taken together, these seek that development is designed to the highest standard and is in-keeping with the existing character of the area.

### **Other Matters**

9. My attention has been drawn to a previous planning permission, Ref 629/APP/2023/3636, described by the appellant as a fall-back position. However, that permission is for a considerably shorter front boundary treatment and so it does not justify the appeal development before me.

### **Conclusion**

10. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

*O Tresise*

INSPECTOR