



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **J J Evans BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/W/24/3357916

Fawns Manor, Fawns Manor Close, Feltham TW14 8EN

- 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 CGR Invest Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/1867.
 - The development proposed is the relocation of vehicular access and car parking to Bedfont Green Close.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal property is referred to by different names. Within the original application it is known as Fawns Manor, the Council refer to it as 1-6 Fawns Manor Close, whilst the listing record refers to it as being Fawns Manor, Bedfont Road. From the evidence provided, including what was apparent at the site inspection, it is the same building, and has been referred to as Fawns Manor for the appeal.
3. Fawns Manor is a grade II listed building within the Bedfont Green Conservation Area. As required by Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) special regard has been paid to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
4. The original application sought both planning permission and listed building consent for the access and car parking, with the Council refusing both. Following the findings of a previous appeal decision (refs: APP/F5540/W/23/3323821 and APP/F5540/Y/23/3323822), the appellant has not appealed against the refusal of listed building consent. For the avoidance of doubt, as set out above, the appeal has been considered with regard to seeking planning permission for the scheme.
5. At the site inspection it was apparent that a pair of metal gates providing access onto Bedfont Green Close had been erected, and that rather than the hedges shown on drawings TP/01 and TP/02, the site boundaries comprised mostly tall fencing covered with artificial greenery. Land levelling and raising has occurred, along with the installation of a gravelled surface to the western side of the building. There was a container, a portacabin and a static caravan within the site, and miscellaneous storage of a variety of building materials and equipment, some of

which was occurring under the canopies of two oaks. Notwithstanding this, the determination of the appeal has been based on the submitted drawings.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this case are:

- The effect of the scheme upon the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to whether it would preserve a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and linked to that, whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area; and
- Whether the scheme would provide safe access and vehicle parking arrangements, having particular regard to the safety of users of Bedfont Green Close.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal site comprises a detached house surrounded by gardens, within which are several mature trees. The house is currently subdivided into flats, and in addition to the access referred to above, there is another off Fawns Manor Close. This latter access serves three parking spaces, an associated turning area and bin store. To the east, south and part of the northern side of the site, there is a modern housing estate, with an area of public open space known as the green to the north.
8. Fawns Manor is a mid-sixteenth century timber framed house and is one of two surviving manor houses within Bedfont, and this and its substantial age and its role in the Civil War are all part of the building's special interest. The house has a variety of historic external alterations, that have resulted in it having an attractive and interesting appearance. The building comprises a variety of materials, ornamental embellishments and detailing, such as the fish-scale hanging tiles, plasterwork, and pitched roof dormers. Two imposing chimney stacks on the northern elevation dominate this side of the building, as well as reflecting its age. The house is to one side of the green within generous grounds. Although there are modern housing estates nearby, the verdant, spaciousness of the grounds of the house and its proximity to the green contribute positively to the setting and significance of this listed building. These features, along with its manorial status, and its size and detached form, are all part of its special historic and architectural interest.
9. The green is an expansive area of open space, and the Bedfont Green Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) describes it as being the heart of the conservation area. Despite the presence of the nearby housing estate, Fawns Manor makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, including being a legible reference to the former rural nature of the settlement. It is one of several high-quality historic buildings that fringe the green and are indicative of the development of the village over time. The expansive nature of the green and the views it affords, including those of the historic buildings around it, is all part of the significance of the conservation area.

10. The development would comprise a gated access from Bedfont Green Close to serve three parking spaces, bin and bicycle storage areas. The existing access and parking area off Fawns Manor Close would be retained as what is described as an “Area for the fire” (drawing TP/586/03 Rev D). In addition to these works, lengths of picket and closed lap fencing would be erected within the site.
11. The extent and nature of the works would involve the loss of large areas of garden, as well as the subdivision and compartmentalisation of that which would remain. The parking, bin and bicycle storage areas would occupy a large part of the site and would have a disproportionately dominating impact upon the building. For the previous appeals seven car parking spaces were proposed, and although the current scheme has reduced the provision to three spaces, hardstanding would nevertheless cover a large area and would result in a substantial loss of the open, garden setting to the listed building. The presence of parked vehicles, bin and bicycle stores would create a busy, utilitarian setting for the listed building, that would include numerous and frequent vehicular and pedestrian movements. The impact of these uses over such a large area would unacceptably clutter the setting of this imposing historic house, detracting from the prominence and special interest of the north and west elevations of the building and the contribution the house makes to the conservation area.
12. Whilst the appellant considers the level of hardstanding would be offset against the “Area for the fire”, the existing access would be retained even if collapsible bollards were erected. There would be a curious duplication of entrances to the site particularly as the existing one is focused on the front door, whilst that from Bedfont Green Close would have little bearing or relevance to the functioning of the house. The existing access has a discreet impact within the conservation area as it derives from one of the roads of the housing estate. However, the access and parking areas from Bedfont Green Close would occur in a conspicuously prominent position and would be visible within the long views available from the green. Not only would the scheme detract from the setting and special interest of the listed building, but it would also erode the spacious, semi-rural nature of the conservation area.
13. Even if boundary landscaping and hardstanding surfacing was to be conditioned, neither measure would mitigate the extent and use of the area. Details of the gates, bin and bicycle stores have not been provided, and in the absence of such information, it cannot be assumed that conditions would ensure that such works would not further detract from the setting and special interest of the listed building and from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
14. Several fences would be erected within the garden that would subdivide it into discrete sections, thereby eroding the spacious garden context to the house. The need for the fences is unclear, and they would appear curiously positioned, compartmentalising the garden space into small areas that would be at odds with the imposing, detached nature of the house within generous gardens. Also unclear is the need for another access and parking area. The provision of two accesses for the property along with the associated uses and internal fencing would all serve to detract from the open garden setting of the house and the contribution it makes to the surrounding area.
15. There are several tall trees within the grounds, including two oaks that would be near to the parking area. These trees create a maturely verdant setting to the

listed building, as well as contributing to the open, rural nature of the green. Whilst the Council has raised no objection to the impact of the scheme upon the trees within the site, the hardstanding would be close to one of the oaks and partly under its crown. No details of root and canopy protection measures have been provided. As these oaks make an important contribution to the conservation area and to the setting of the house, the imposition of conditions in the absence of protection measures would not provide certainty that the works would ensure the ongoing health and vitality of the trees.

16. The appellant has referred to there being no restrictive conditions on the site which control changes to the grounds. Irrespective of this, planning permission would be required for the access and ground levelling works, and this significantly tempers the weight that can be attributed to this matter.
17. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. In this case the scheme would lead to less than substantial harm to the conservation area and to the listed building given the impact of the works upon the size of the conservation area and that of the setting of the manor, albeit these harms would be at the lower end of this category. Nevertheless, these harms would still be considerable given that the Framework attributes great weight to an asset's conservation, and they have to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including where appropriate, securing the optimum viable use.
18. As the house is currently occupied, the scheme would not be necessary to secure the continued use of the building, and particularly so in this case as there is already an existing access, parking and bin store provision. Undertaking maintenance of the house and grounds, and the removal of the portacabin and stored materials could occur irrespective of the scheme. The benefits that arise would be personal rather than public ones and would not outweigh the considerable harms to the conservation area and to the listed building.
19. For these reasons the scheme would result in unacceptable harm to the setting and special interest of the listed building and would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. The suggested conditions would not overcome these harms. There would be conflict with the Act, with the Framework, and also with Policies CC1 and CC4 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan (2015) (LP), as these policies seek amongst other things, development that sustains and conserves areas that have a high quality, well established and coherent character, and that which conserves and takes an opportunity to enhance any heritage asset and its setting.

Highways

20. In addition to the existing vehicular access to the house from Fawns Manor Close there is a separate dedicated pedestrian gate to the north of the site. The access from Bedfont Green Close would lead into an area that provides three parking spaces, turning space, and a bin and bicycle store area. In order to ensure that the maximum parking standards requirement of LP Policy EC2 and London Plan Policy T6.1 would not be breached, the appellant has suggested that the existing parking area would be grassed over, and that a condition could require a vehicle-proof barrier to prevent all but emergency vehicles from using this access.

21. A draft Fire Strategy Report has been provided for the appeal, although it does not convincingly demonstrate how the “Area for the fire” would operate just for times of emergency, nor even why there is a need for such a large, dedicated space that would be separate to the proposed parking and turning area. Moreover, drawings provided for the appeal (Drg Nos TP/586/03 Rev D & TP/586/03 Rev E) show the existing access as being open rather than closed. Even if collapsible bollards could be installed as suggested by the appellant, there remains ambiguity and uncertainty regarding the control of the existing access. If the access was not closed a grassed surface for the “Area for the Fire” would not preclude parking.
22. As regards the access onto Bedfont Green Close, this road is speed restricted to 20mph, and has one footway, which provides pedestrian access to the service core of Bedfont and is likely to form a well-used route. Whilst the Council consider the crossover would accord with the width requirements of the Residential Crossovers and Off-Street Parking Policy (2016) (CPP), the provision of a second access to the property would unacceptably interfere with pedestrians using the footway, and particularly so given this is the only footway along the road.
23. The previous Inspector referred to the provision of visibility splays of 25m in both directions. For those exiting the property there would be views available of other users of the highway who approach from the south. Notwithstanding this, there is a sharp bend in the road to the north, and this along with the narrow nature of the road, the severity of the bend and its proximity to the access, would all combine to provide little opportunity for those exiting the property to see anyone approaching. Irrespective of the collision data provided by the appellant, the safety of all other users of the highway would be severely compromised by the access, contrary to the requirements of the Framework that requires the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles to be minimised. The appellant suggests a condition to provide the required splays prior to use, but the circumstances of this case are such that conditions could not achieve the required visibility to ensure the safety of other users of the highway.
24. For these reasons, the scheme would have an access that would jeopardise the safety of other users of Bedfont Green Close, and there is ambiguity and uncertainty concerning the control and use of the existing access and parking area. The suggested conditions would not overcome these fundamental harms, and there would be conflict with the Framework, and with London Plan Policy T6.1, LP Policy EC2, and with the CPP. As these seek, amongst other things, that adverse impacts on the transport network are avoided, that properties should only have one vehicle access onto the public highway, and that the maximum parking standards as set out in the London Plan are not exceeded, for the reasons given above the scheme would fail to accord with these requirements.

Other Matters

25. Local residents have raised a number of other matters, including property devaluation and the current uses occurring on the site. The Council has referred to enforcement action being underway, and as regards the other matters, given the findings on the main issues, there is no need to consider them further.

Conclusion

26. The scheme would unacceptably harm the setting of the listed building and its special interest and would neither preserve nor enhance the character or

appearance of the conservation area. The access would jeopardise the safety of other users of the highway, and there is unresolved ambiguity regarding the retention and use of the existing access and its associated parking. There would be conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Thus, for the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

J J Evans

INSPECTOR