



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2026

by **Mark Caine BSc (Hons) MTPL MRTPI LSRA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/C/24/3355685

Premises known as 230 Gunnersbury Avenue, Chiswick W3 8LB

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Mr George Papatheodorou against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The notice was issued on 14 October 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is Without planning permission, the unauthorised installation of uPVC windows to a dwellinghouse and the unauthorised application of grey render to the first floor rear elevation of the dwellinghouse.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 - i. Remove all of the window and frames from the dwellinghouse which includes, the front elevation of the house, the rear elevation of the house, the single storey rear extension and the rear roof dormer.
 - ii. Remove the grey render from the first floor rear elevation of the dwellinghouse.
 - iii. Install timber sash, painted white frames and windows (as show in Figure 1) to the dwellinghouse which includes, the front elevation of the house, the rear elevation of the house, the single storey rear extension and the rear roof dormer.
 - iv. Restore the first floor rear elevation of the dwellinghouse to its original condition prior to the breach taking place.
 - v. Remove all resultant debris from the Land.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 3 months after the date this notice takes effect.
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(a), (f), (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary Decision: The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted in the terms set out in the Formal Decision.

Appeal on ground (a)

1. An appeal on ground (a) is brought on the basis that planning permission ought to be granted for the matters stated in the notice as constituting a breach of planning control.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Gunnersbury Park Conservation Area (GPCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a mid terraced dwelling that is situated within one of several short rows of terraced properties on Gunnersbury Avenue. The appeal site is located within the GPCA which is covered by an Article 4(2) Direction. This removes some permitted development rights for extensions and alterations to properties.

4. The terms of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
5. I consider the significance of the GPCA, insofar as this appeal is concerned, to derive from its architectural and historic interest, comprising the historic park and garden of Gunnersbury Park, a cemetery and early inter-war housing estates. The GPCA Conservation Area Appraisal (2018) (CAA) sets out that the appeal site lies within the Gunnersbury Park Estate character area, which consists primarily of interwar housing and its associated recreation and retail facilities.
6. The CAA recognises that windows and doors are key features in any building's character and identifies the continued pressure for insensitively proportioned replacement windows as a threat. It also provides an annotated example of an original Gunnersbury Park Estate window, which is referred to in the enforcement notice.
7. Nonetheless, I have no reason to doubt the appellant's claim that the previous windows in the appeal property had aluminium frames. I appreciate that original timber window frames may be an attractive feature of some individual buildings in the conservation area. However, it was evident on my site visit that significantly more replacement white uPVC windows of varying styles exist within the terrace rows on Gunnersbury Avenue than original style timber ones. Indeed, the appellant's submitted schedule of window frames demonstrates that only 3 out of 42 dwellings surveyed on Gunnersbury Avenue have solely white timber window frames. There was nothing that I saw on my site visit to suggest that this is inaccurate.
8. I appreciate that some of these may have been installed prior to the Article 4 Direction, without the need for planning permission; however, due to the widespread use of uPVC it now appears as a dominant characteristic of Gunnersbury Avenue. As such, I consider original style, sash timber window frames to not be an important feature of the GPCA's significance as a heritage asset. The uPVC materials, bulk of the frames and opening methods of the windows therefore do not appear incongruous given the surrounding context.
9. Furthermore, although most of the properties in the immediate vicinity appear to have original pebble dash to the rear elevation, many nearby dwellings, including the adjoining property at No 228, have rear elevations that are rendered in white or a cream colour at first floor level. Garages to the rear of Gunnersbury Avenue also vary in terms of materials. Therefore, whilst pebble dash is prevalent, painted pebble dash and render are also readily apparent. As such, I do not consider there to be high levels of uniformity as the Council suggest.
10. It is obvious that rendering offers a sharper, and in general smoother finish than the pebble dash. However, the pale light grey colour of the render is not noticeably different to the white render of the adjoining property at No 228 or other rendered rear elevations nearby. It therefore does not look out of keeping with those properties which are rendered or painted white or cream. Accordingly, the replacement of the original pebble dash with painted render does not appear incompatible with the established character or appearance of its surroundings.
11. Nevertheless, I recognise that the stark colour contrast of the dark anthracite grey window frames when seen next to the white window frames of neighbouring

properties draws the eye and accentuates their visual prominence. In response to this, the appellant has expressed a willingness to spray paint all of the frames white. I am satisfied that this could be achieved via an appropriately worded planning condition. This, in my view, would provide suitable mitigation to reduce their prominence and offer unity and consistency with the neighbouring terrace rows.

12. Therefore, taking account of the characteristics of this part of Gunnersbury Avenue, I find that the uPVC window frames, subject to an appropriately worded planning condition, and the application of the light grey render on the first floor rear elevation of No 230 does not harm the significance of the GPCA.
13. Accordingly, I find that the development preserves the character or appearance of the GPCA. It thereby does not conflict with Policies CC1, CC2, CC4 and SC7 of the London Borough of Hounslow Local Plan, 2015-2030 (2015). These seek, amongst other matters, for high quality design in all development within the Borough which respects the local character of the area and conserves, and takes opportunities to enhance, the significance of heritage assets.
14. Similarly, no conflict arises with advice contained in the Council's Residential Extensions Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (2017). This seeks, amongst other things, to ensure the range of materials for extensions are kept to a minimum and that developments would not harm the character of a conservation area or the building itself.

Conditions

15. I have included a condition to ensure that the uPVC window frames are painted white to mitigate their prominence and preserve the character or appearance of the GPCA.
16. The purpose of this condition is to require the appellant to comply with a strict timetable for dealing with the external colouring which needs to be addressed in order to make the development acceptable. The condition is drafted in this form because, unlike an application for planning permission for development yet to commence, in the case of a retrospective grant of permission it is not possible to use a negatively worded condition precedent to secure the subsequent approval and implementation of the outstanding detailed matter because the development has already taken place.
17. The condition therefore provides for the loss of the effective benefit of the grant of planning permission where the requirements are not met by the time set by the condition. Should the requirements of the condition not be met in line with the strict timetable, then the windows and uPVC frames will be removed.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal succeeds on ground (a). I shall grant planning permission for the development as described in the notice. The appeal on grounds (f) and (g) do not therefore fall to be considered.

Formal Decision

19. The appeal is allowed, the enforcement notice is quashed, and planning permission is granted on the application deemed to have been made under section

177(5) of the 1990 Act as amended for the development already carried out, namely the unauthorised installation of uPVC windows to a dwellinghouse and the unauthorised application of grey render to the first floor rear elevation of the dwellinghouse at 230 Gunnersbury Avenue, Cheswick W3 8LB as shown on the plan attached to the notice and subject to the following condition:

- 1) The windows and uPVC frames hereby permitted shall be removed from the building and all materials arising from their removal shall be removed from the land within 4 months of the date of failure to meet the requirement set out in i) below:
 - i) Within 3 months of the date of this decision the external surfaces of the uPVC frames hereby permitted, shall be painted in white. The white colouring of the frames shall thereafter be retained.

Mark Caine

INSPECTOR