



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by R C Shrimplin MA(Cantab) DipArch RIBA FRTPI FCIArb MCIL

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Reference: APP/A5270/D/25/3369409

14 Queen Anne's Grove, Chiswick, London W4 1HN

- 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. and Mrs. C. Morrison against the decision of Ealing Council.
 - The application reference is 250372HH.
 - The development proposed is described in the application form as "Replacement of unoriginal front fence to match original design and adjacent properties".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the "replacement of front fence with palisade style fence", at 14 Queen Anne's Grove, Chiswick, London W4 1HN, in accordance with the terms of the application (reference 250372HH), subject to the conditions set out in the attached Schedule of Conditions.

Preliminary points

2. Notwithstanding the description of the development that was given in the application form, the nature of the proposed development can more succinctly be described as set out in the Council's decision notice and in the appeal form, as the "replacement of front fence with palisade style fence".

Main issue

3. The main issue to be determined in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings in the Bedford Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in a residential area of west London, to the north of the central part of Chiswick. Queen Anne's Grove is part of an established suburb that is now designated as the Bedford Park Conservation Area. Bedford Park became a suburban settlement from the late nineteenth century, and the development is an important contribution to the Arts & Crafts aesthetic movement.
5. This part of Bedford Park is characterised by substantial houses, often detached or semi-detached in form, on good sized plots behind small front gardens. The front boundaries are defined in various ways, usually with fences or walls of various designs. In some cases, low close-boarded timber fences mark the edges of the highways, although these are varied in design, some being plainer and less in keeping with the Arts & Crafts style than others. In several cases, in the vicinity of

the appeal site, “palisade” fences have been constructed, making use of brick piers with more elaborate painted wooden fences between the piers.

6. Number 14 Queen Anne’s Grove is a substantial semi-detached home in an Arts & Crafts design by R N Shaw, as a variant on a semi-detached design that appears elsewhere in Bedford Park. It is a two-storey building (with attics and Dutch gables) constructed of red brick with some enrichment, under tiled roofs. Together with its neighbour at number 12, it is listed (Grade II) as a “building of special architectural or historic interest”.
7. The appeal site has a simple “shiplap” wooden fence on the front boundary. The fence is of stained timber (rather than being painted), with a hedge behind and above it, and it is in need of some repair.
8. Planning permission (but not listed building consent) is now sought to replace the existing front fence with a palisade style fence.
9. Provisions in the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 impose obligations on those considering whether to grant planning permission for development that would affect a listed building. In such cases, it is necessary to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any feature of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Other provisions in the Act require decision makers to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas affected by development proposals.
10. Those formal requirements are reinforced by the ‘National Planning Policy Framework’, especially at Section 16, which emphasises the importance of conserving or enhancing the historic environment,
11. Policies in the Development Plan also reinforce the underlying principles that are established in the primary legislation. In ‘The London Plan’ (dated March 2021), Policies D.3 and D.4 promote good design generally, while Policy HC1 focusses on the historic heritage,
12. In both Ealing Council’s ‘Development Strategy 2026’ (which was adopted in April 2012) and their ‘Development Management Development Plan Document’ (which was adopted in April 2013), there is, likewise, an emphasis on the need to encourage good design and to protect historic character. Policy 7C in the latter deals specifically with “Heritage” issues.
13. The ‘Bedford Park Conservation Area Management Plan’ (dated 2007) is not a planning policy document itself (in a formal sense) but it is material to this appeal and it draws attention to the threat posed by “unsympathetic, poorly designed and executed new buildings, extensions and alterations”. It identifies a number of detailed design considerations, which include a specific concern to avoid the replacement of boundaries by unsympathetic gates and brick and metal enclosures.
14. The proposed new front boundary fence and gate would be constructed of traditional materials, brick piers with timber railings. The new fence would be modest in height and not unduly imposing, although it is described as a “palisade” fence. It would be similar (if not identical) to other fences in the vicinity, where more formal fences seem to predominate.

15. In spite of the more formal appearance of the new fence, by comparison with the existing timber “shiplap” fence, the new brick and painted timber railing would reflect the designs of fences either side of number 14 and would not be out of place in its setting. In this way, it would preserve the essential character and appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building (and of other nearby buildings).
16. The existing fence appears to follow a historic pattern for fences in the Conservation Area but it does not have a particular significance in architectural terms that could require its retention, notwithstanding the listed status of the house at number 14.
17. The appeal scheme would amount to a modest change to the existing property at 14 Queen Anne’s Grove and it would have only a limited impact on the local streetscene. I have been referred to other examples of fences in the vicinity but I have formed my own opinion of the current proposal in its context and I have concluded that it would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. It would not give rise to material planning harm.
18. Hence, I have concluded that the project would not be in conflict with the primary legislation, national planning policies or the Development Plan, and that it is acceptable in planning terms. In short, I am persuaded that the scheme before me can properly be granted planning permission and, although I have considered all the matters that have been raised in the representations, I have found nothing to cause me to alter my decision.
19. I have, however, also considered the need for conditions and, in imposing conditions, I have taken account of the conditions suggested by the Council in the usual way (without prejudice to their main arguments in the appeal). In particular, I have concluded that conditions are necessary, to define the planning permission and to ensure that quality is maintained. A condition to require the materials of the new fence to match those used in the existing building is clearly redundant, but the scheme must be completed in accordance with the submitted details.
20. I have also noted that a comment has been made regarding the potential impact of the proposals on an existing tree. I accept the conclusions of the submitted ‘Tree Survey and Arboricultural Impact Assessment’ and I am convinced that there is no overriding objection to be made to the scheme in consequence of the potential effect of the proposed construction on tree roots. Nevertheless, I accept that supporting material is necessary, as indicated in the Officer’s Report on the planning application, to show how the work would be managed to avoid harm to any tree. I have therefore imposed an additional condition to this effect.

Roger C. Shrimplin

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:
 - drawing number PD14 (Location Plan);
 - drawing number PD14 (Existing Site Plan);
 - drawing number PD14 (Existing and Proposed Front Garden Plan);
 - drawing number PD14 (Existing and Proposed Fence Elevation);
 - drawing number PD14 (Fence Detailing);
- 3) No excavation works shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. All these works shall be carried out as finally approved in detail. The details to be submitted shall include proposed and existing finished levels, and functional services above and below ground. The details of the soft landscape works shall include details of all existing trees in the vicinity of the proposed development (and details of the method of protecting them during the course of the work).