



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2025

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 06 May 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/D/25/3362544**

**Beaulieu, Cavendish Road, Chiswick, London W4 3UH**

- 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 and Mrs N Ferguson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
  - The application Reference is P/2024/3773.
  - The development proposed is the erection of front boundary wall and gates.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of front boundary wall and gates at Beaulieu, Cavendish Road, Chiswick, London W4 3UH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P/2024/3773, subject to the following condition:
  1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Unnumbered Location Plan; Beaulieu CRW4\_FPW-01-B & CRW4\_FPW-03-B; and Planning and Heritage Statement Beaulieu.

### Preliminary Matter

2. The development has been partially completed; this does not alter my approach to determining the merits of the proposal

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached home of significant scale and with readily-visible attractive and well-proportioned elevations. The locality is one of established residential character and the arrangement of traditional sizeable dwellings results in an area of very pleasing and generally spacious appearance. The proposal is as described above.
  5. The site lies within the Grove Park Conservation Area (CA). There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation
-

Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The Council's Local Plan (LP) Policy CC4 reflects this. LP Policies CC1, CC2 and SC7 are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would display good quality harmonious design, complement the host property and its context and reflect local distinctiveness.

6. The Council, in summary, is concerned that the scheme's size and appearance are alien in the CA and would fail to maintain or enhance its appearance and character or the streetscene.
7. It is certainly important that appropriate frontage boundaries are displayed in streets, particularly within Conservation Areas. Often one sees good quality suburbia predominantly characterised by frontage hedging or consistent styles of enclosure which should be protected.
8. However, in this instance that is not the case. In this stretch of road and nearby in the wider CA the pattern which prevails does include walling, fencing, hedging, gates, railings and driveway arrangements; with the enclosures being of varied but usually modest heights. Many properties do not have gates but I am satisfied that those proposed here would not impact upon the CA Appraisal's cited aim to 'retain the spacious environment'. The post-box and intercom would not appreciably add street side clutter on this particular stretch of road.
9. The quality of the streetscene primarily stems from the variety and visually impressive houses themselves which are open to view from the road, rather than any uniformity or pattern of the frontage treatments. In my opinion it would not be appropriate to have overly high frontage-built screening but that is not the proposal in this instance. The 1.35m height whilst above the Council's quoted guidance of 1m would not appear unreasonable and the fact that the previous treatment was about 1.3 has some pertinence. The railing style gates would not be jarring on the eye in my assessment.
10. In the circumstances, to my mind, the proposal would not be at all eye-catching or harmful to the visual merits of the scene, the appeal property, its setting or the wider CA in character or appearance terms which would be preserved.
11. Given the foregoing I conclude that the appeal proposal would not be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would not conflict with the development plan policies which I cite in paragraph 5 above.

#### *Conditions*

12. The Council suggests the standard commencement condition but this is not necessary as construction has begun. I agree that there should be a condition that works are to be carried out in accordance with listed, approved, plans; to provide certainty.

*Overall conclusion*

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would not have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property or the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR