



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2026

by Robert Naylor BSc (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/F5540/C/24/3340528

Fawns Manor House, Hounslow TW14 8EN

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the 1990 Act) as amended.
- The appeal is made by CGR Invest Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Hounslow.
- The notice was issued on 1 March 2024.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is *without planning permission, the unauthorised placement of porta-cabins (shown by the blue 'Xs' on the attached plan) fencing and gates (shown by the red outer edged line and stand-alone red lines, but excluding the red line around Fawns Manor (in green) on the attached plan), installation of hard standing & associated paraphernalia (shown by the black stars on the attached plan).*
- The requirements of the notice are:
 - i. *Remove the porta-cabins (shown by the blue 'Xs' on the attached plan)*
 - ii. *Demolish the fencing and gates (shown by the red outer edged line and stand-alone red lines, but excluding the red line around Fawns Manor (in green) on the attached plan)*
 - iii. *Remove the hard standing and replant in garden and lawn to a pre-development standard as per the attached Aerial from the 29th June 2019*
 - iv. *Remove all associated paraphernalia (shown by the black stars on the attached plan)*
 - v. *Remove all resultant debris from the premises.*
- The period for compliance with the requirement *3 month after the notice takes effect.*
- The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2)(b) and (c) of the 1990 Act (as amended).

Formal Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Appeal under ground (b)

2. An appeal on this ground is that the matters alleged in the enforcement notice, have not occurred. In order to succeed on this ground, the appellant must demonstrate that, on the balance of probability, the matters stated in the notice have not occurred as a matter of fact.
3. Fawns Manor is a Grade II listed building (List Entry Number: 1188725) located within the Bedfont Green Conservation Area (BGCA). Fawns Manor has been converted into six flats which appeared occupied at the time of my site visit. During my visit I observed the boundary consisted of metal Harris fencing which had been covered with artificial greenery. The boundary provided an effective screen, limiting views into the appeal site. There is also a large set of gates providing a very wide accessway into the curtilage of the property.
4. To the rear of Fawns Manor was a large grey portacabin, and within the curtilage of the site was a plethora of items being stored including cars, fridges, freezers, washing machines, road signs and bollards, amongst other items. The appeal site also contained two yellow metal containers, a static caravan and smaller caravan

on wheels. The appeal site therefore had the appearance of a scrap metal yard or similar refuse and recycling facility, rather than a residential curtilage.

5. Both parties agree that the various forms of development subject to the notice are located at the site. The appellant contends that the portacabins, fencing and gates, hard standing and associated paraphernalia have been erected as 'permitted development' (PD) under Schedule 2, Part 4, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO), as these were temporary buildings and structures used in connection with the construction of an access and car park at the site. Nevertheless, planning permissions¹ have been refused by the Council and subsequently dismissed at appeals², yet the development remains in situ.
6. Consequently, as the breach of planning control has occurred within four years from the date of issue of the notice, the appeal against the operational development under ground (b) must fail.

Appeal under ground (c)

7. An appeal on this ground is made on the basis that the matters stated in the enforcement notice (if they occurred) do not constitute a breach of planning control. As with ground (b) above, the burden of proof is again firmly on the appellant to make their case, on the balance of probabilities.
8. The appellant contends the development alleged in the enforcement notice would be considered PD under Schedule 2, Part 4, Class A of the GPDO, as these were temporary buildings and structures used in connection with the proposed construction works at the site. The development subject to these works has been refused planning permission and dismissed at appeal twice. In dismissing these appeals, the Inspectors found that the proposed development would provide unacceptable harm to the listed building and its special interest; would neither preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the BGCA and would jeopardise the safety of other users of the highway.
9. Under condition A.2 of the GPDO, the temporary structures are required to be removed as soon as reasonably practicable, and land reinstated to its condition prior to the works being carried out. Given planning permission is required for the construction of an access and car park at the site, and no permission has been granted or is deemed to be granted, the development would be in breach of condition A.2. Therefore, the matters stated in the notice have occurred, and I conclude that the appellant has not shown, on the balance of probabilities, that they do not constitute a breach of planning control.
10. The appeal on ground (c) therefore fails.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

Robert Naylor INSPECTOR

¹ London Borough of Hounslow Planning Refs: P/2023/0909 01557/A/P3; P/2023/0910 01557/A/L3 and P/2024/1867

² PINS Refs: APP/F5540/W/23/3323821; APP/F5540/Y/23/3323822 and APP/F5540/W/24/3357916