
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2021

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/21/3284880

7 Roman Road, LONDON, W4 1NA

- 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 & Mrs Steve Garry against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref 01250/7/P6, dated 3 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the front boundary wall and hedge and replacement with a brick wall and painted fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the removal of the front boundary wall and hedge and replacement with a brick wall and painted fence at 7 Roman Road, LONDON, W4 1NA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 01250/7/P6, dated 3 June 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: N303/SG/PP/1.0 – 7.0 inclusive.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed replacement boundary wall and fence on the character and appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 7 is a semi-detached house situated at the southern end of Roman Road, close to its junction with Flanders Road. Roman Road lies within the Bedford Park Conservation Area (CA). Nos 1 – 7, and Nos 2 – 10 opposite, are semi-detached or detached houses of similar design, though each would appear to have a different type of boundary treatment. No 7 has a very low brick wall with hedge above and behind. At the time of my visit the wall was in poor condition. The proposed replacement boundary treatment would be a brick wall, some 600mm high, with a 750mm high, painted joinery palisade fence above. The fence posts at each end would reach a height of approximately 1.7 metres including an ornamental top.

4. Policy CC1 of the Council's Local Plan (LP) indicates that development should respond to the wider context and history of the area. Policy CC4 indicates that any development within or affecting a Conservation Area must conserve and take opportunities to enhance the character of the area, and respect the grain, scale, form, proportions and materials of the surrounding area and existing architecture. Policy SC7 indicates that development proposals should complement the original building, harmonise with adjoining properties and maintain the character of the general street scene and the character and amenity of private spaces.
5. The Council's Residential Extensions Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) indicates that any new development in conservation areas must preserve and/or enhance the special character and appearance of the area. Development must be of a high standard of design and respect the existing boundary treatment around the site.
6. In this case, the Council contends that the proposed front boundary, by reason of its design and appearance would be an inappropriate development and harmful to the house, street and wider conservation area.
7. The appellants contend that the front boundary fence designed for No 7 Roman Road is modelled on the style of a traditional Bedford Park fence commonly found throughout the estate and is one of several traditional styles in the area. Moreover, they note that the Bedford Park Society identifies a number of different historic fence styles within the CA, and that the fence would be suitable in scale/design in its street setting near its junction with Flanders Road.
8. There is no clear characteristic style of front boundary treatment along Roman Road. Nos 1 and 3 have close-boarded fences with hedge and/or shrubs above and/or behind. No 5 has a rendered wall with fence/hedge above. On the opposite of the road Nos 2 – 10 have a mix of walls, fences and small black and white palisade-type fences. There is a high brick wall to the side of No 23 Flanders Road, adjacent to the driveway at the appeal property, and there is a high fence to part of the front boundary between Nos 6 and 8. On this basis, the proposed front boundary at No 7 would not appear out of character.
9. Whilst there are no other examples of 'traditional' Bedford Park palisade fences along Roman Road, there are a few examples along Bath Road to the north and Flanders Road to the south. Those on Bath Road have matching gates, both pedestrian and vehicular. Those on Flanders Road, including those in very close proximity to the appeal property, exhibit variety in the designs of the fence post tops; some have pedestrian gates to match; while the only vehicular gates to such properties, which are at No 46, are of non-traditional design.
10. Given the range of boundary treatments along both Roman Road and Flanders Road, together with the variation in the detailed designs of the 'traditional'-styled palisade fences along Flanders Road, in the vicinity of the appeal property, I do not consider that the proposal at No 7 Roman Road would be harmful to the character or appearance of the area. I acknowledge that only No 7 would have an open access to a short drive, but as this is already the situation, the continued existence of this gap would not be harmful. Moreover, given the poor condition of the existing low wall, the proposed replacement treatment could arguably be considered as an enhancement.

11. In conclusion, therefore, I find that the proposed front boundary treatment at the appeal property would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA, and could be said to be an enhancement of the current situation. It would not conflict with Policies CC1, CC4 or SC7 of the LP, or with the guidance on new development in conservation areas given in the SPD.

Conditions

12. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR