
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by K Dryden BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/25/3373152

Rookery Nook, Brunner Road, London W5 1BA

- 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 Haidar Harab against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref is 251048HH.
 - The development proposed is increasing height of the front fence and installing an electric sliding gate.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form does not accurately reflect the proposal. It was noted on my site visit that the existing boundary treatment, including brick wall, has been removed entirely and steel posts have been erected on the site boundary. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.
3. The site is located within a Conservation Area and in determining this appeal I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). The statutory duty requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area having particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The CA retains much of its original Garden City layout and incorporates an informal road layout of soft curves with cottage-style properties, with predominantly two-storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings set back from the road with low boundary hedging. The appeal property is located towards the southern end of the CA, where the properties are laid out parallel to the street in a more formal arrangement. Street trees line the road which in combination with the soft landscaping treatment of front garden areas, provides a verdant and pleasant environment. The overall uniformity makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey dwelling generously set back from the road with off street parking to the front garden area. The property was constructed in the 1950s and does not form part of the original CA estate layout, providing a neutral contribution to the CA.
7. The proposed metal fence and sliding gate would span the width of the front boundary of the site, retaining the side boundary hedge with the neighbouring property to the corner of Brunner Road and Pitshanger Lane. The proposed plans show that an 'existing brick fence' would be retained, however, from my site visit the existing boundary treatment has been removed. The metal fence and gate would be substantial in height, supported by steel posts which were prominently in place at the time of my visit.
8. The Brentham Garden Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal, 2008 sets out that special emphasis was placed in Brentham on the use of hedges and front gardens rather than hard boundaries such as brick walls or fencing. The substantial scale and incongruous design of the development would appear out of place in this setting, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the area which would fail to preserve or enhance the CA.
9. In terms of the Framework, the harm that I have identified would be less than substantial given the limited scale of the development. Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has sited safety, security and privacy needs to justify the proposal. However, I have minimal information before me to demonstrate that the benefits of the appeal scheme could not be achieved in a less harmful way. I am satisfied that these benefits should only be given limited weight, which is insufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the relevant designated heritage asset (CA).
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and would result in unjustified harm to the significance of the CA with a failure to preserve or enhance. This is contrary to policies HC1, D3 and D4 of the London Plan, 2021 which together seek development of a high quality design that integrates the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings with responses that contribute to their significance and sense of place. Furthermore, proposals should respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets that contribute towards the local character.
11. The proposed development is also contrary to policies 7B, 7C and 7.4 of the Ealing Development Management Development Plan Document, 2013. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development of heritage assets and their settings should retain and enhance characteristic features and avoid the introduction of design and materials that undermine the significance of the CA.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

K Dryden

INSPECTOR