



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 6 June 2025

by **S Edwards BA MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/F5540/W/25/3363554

18 Priory Avenue, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 1TY

- 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 Ramsey and Pauline Khoury and James against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/3702.
 - The development proposed is described as “Replacement of front fence with a Bedford Park palisade style fence”.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/F5540/Y/25/3363557

18 Priory Avenue, Chiswick, Hounslow, London W4 1TY

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Ramsey and Pauline Khoury and James against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
 - The application Ref is P/2024/4016.
 - The works proposed are described as “Replacement of front fence with a Bedford Park palisade style fence”.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal scheme affects a listed building located in a conservation area, and I have therefore had special regard to Sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).
4. As both appeals relate to the same site and the issues raised are of a similar nature, I shall consider them in a single document, in the interests of brevity.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development and works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of no 18 Priory Avenue, a Grade II listed building (List Entry Number: 1080291), and preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Bedford Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

6. The appeal site lies within Bedford Park CA, the significance of which is primarily derived from its attractive properties designed for the aesthetically minded middle

classes. This, together with the careful disposition of buildings and their relationship with boundary treatments, as well as its green spaces and mature trees, gave it the predominantly rural, relaxed and informal character of a village. Bedford Park remains as one of if not the best-known and best-preserved later Victorian suburb in outer London. It has long been considered as a prototype for the garden cities and suburbs that were subsequently built.

7. Together with 16 Priory Avenue (no 16), the appeal property forms a pair of semi-detached dwellings jointly listed at Grade II, which were originally designed by Norman Shaw (though the design may have been subsequently altered by Edward J May when he took over as the Estate Architect for Bedford Park). Like many other listed buildings sited within the CA, the appeal property owes much of its significance to its historic interest and its rich architectural detailing typical of the Queen Anne Revival Style, as notably illustrated by its monumental chimney stack, modillion eave cornice, bay window and elaborate brickwork.
8. The appeal property has previously been subdivided into flats and been subject to a number of unfortunate alterations, including the relocation of the front door to the side elevation, though this is to be reinstated as part of previously consented works to restore the property as a single dwelling. As one of the historic properties built as part of the development of Bedford Park and due to its architectural detailing, there is no doubt that the appeal property contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
9. Whilst there are commonalities with the design of the properties, the individual detailing of the houses, together with the carefully designed front garden walls and fences, all play a crucial part in the composition of Bedford Park, the variety adding interest to the pleasant character of this suburban area. The CA displays different types of front boundary treatments, including close boarded fencing and low brick walls with white painted timber palisade style fencing and gates, often complemented by brick piers with ornate ball finials and hedging.
10. As noted within the CA statement, 'the intention appears to have been for a variety of boundaries rather than a consistent approach per street, providing interest rather than uniformity'. Particular styles of over-elaborate fencing where these did not form part of the origin design are identified as a pressure on the CA, as they lead to joining up instead of variety.
11. The appellants' submissions notably rely on pictures showing parts of Bedford Park with consistent and differing boundary treatments but in my view, this is no clear indication of how the properties, and those along Priory Avenue in particular, may have actually looked historically. And although it is suggested that the brick piers found at the appeal site are consistent with those found at properties that have palisade fences, I similarly observed several examples of brick piers with close boarded fencing. Having regard to the available evidence and my own observations, I am not therefore certain that brick piers were historically associated with a particular type of fencing.
12. The site lies within a section of Priory Avenue, which includes a number of front boundaries with close boarded fencing, although the majority of properties have palisade style fencing. Despite some minor variations to the detailing and height of the fences, these properties generally stand out within the street scene by reason

of their distinctive style and white finish. The high number of properties with palisade fencing gives the street scene a strong sense of uniformity and formality.

13. Although the site was boarded up at the time of my visit, the plans show that the existing front boundary comprises a close boarded timber fence with brick piers and decorative ball finials. It matches the form of front boundary treatment found at no 16, the adjoining property. It is unclear, having regard to the available information, whether the appeal property was originally built with this type of boundary treatment. However, no detailed evidence has been presented either to demonstrate that the property would have originally been constructed with a palisade fence.
14. The appeal scheme would enable the gate to be reinstated in line with the historic front entrance to the appeal property, which would be positive. However, the proposed palisade fence would appear at odds with the front boundary of no 16 and in doing so disconnect the sense of harmony which presently characterises this pair of semi-detached properties, to the detriment of their significance as a jointly listed building. The appeal scheme would also exacerbate the sense of contrived uniformity along Priory Avenue and erode further the variety of boundary treatments which, as a result, would have an incrementally harmful effect on the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.
15. The proposed development and works would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building and Bedford Park CA. Although the extent of the harm would be sited towards the lower end of the spectrum, this is a consideration to which I nevertheless ascribe considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I understand that the existing fence is in a dilapidated state and needs replacing. However, in the absence of substantive evidence demonstrating otherwise, I see no reason why this could not be achieved on a like-for-like basis. Overall, and whilst the reinstatement of the gate would be positive, none of the presented benefits would in this particular instance outweigh the identified harm.
16. In reaching these conclusions, I have had regard to the appeal decisions which have been allowed at 23 Addison Grove and 3 Fairfax Road. Having considered the presented information, I find that the circumstances of these particular schemes do not represent a direct parallel to the proposed development and works, for example because of the type of boundary treatment that was being replaced or found at the adjoining property, the corner plot location, etc. My attention has also been drawn to the applications at 16 Queen Annes Grove, recently granted by Ealing Council, within which part of Bedford Park CA is situated. In the absence of the full details which led to these applications being granted, I cannot be certain that meaningful comparisons can be drawn with the proposals before me. For all these reasons, I have only ascribed limited weight to these examples.
17. The appeal scheme would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building. It would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bedford Park Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposed development and works would conflict with the aims of Policies CC1, CC4 and SC7 of Hounslow Local Plan 2015-2030 (LP), as well as the Council's

Residential Extensions Guidelines and Section 16 of the Framework. Amongst other things, these expect proposals to complement the original building, but also conserve and take opportunities to enhance any heritage asset and its setting in manner appropriate to its significance. I however find no conflict with LP Policy CC2, which relates to urban design and architecture and is considered of limited relevance to the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR