

HANWELL VILLAGE GREEN CONSERVATION AREA

Date Designated 1974
Extended 1982, 2004.

Last Appraisal March 2008

Last Management Plan March 2008

Existing Article 4 Direction



Map



Summary and key changes since last appraisal

The CA has two areas of distinct character:

1. To the north- informal attractive village green, late C.18 and C.19 and C.20 buildings set in spacious plots with many trees- around northern section of Church Road, and area around Hanwell Green and Cuckoo Lane. Rural village character. Links with open spaces to north and west (Brent Valley Golf Course

	<p>and Churchfields Recreation Ground) and with Churchfields CA which hosts St. Mary's Church (rebuilt C.12, Grade II* designed by Gilbert Scott).</p> <p>2. To south, planned residential development from 1880s onwards, instigated by Hanwell Station (Brunel's original 1836 and rebuilt in 1877). Semis/detached family houses. Also, inter-war development. On all four main streets (Manor Court Road, Alwyne Road, Golden Manor, Campbell Road) there is a common building line, creating space for modest front gardens.</p> <p>The CA Appraisal (2008) noted that there was a range of buildings mostly in residential use. Good examples of use of traditional materials including red brick, clay tiles, and timber. Attractive porches and front doors of special merit. Spatial character strongly defined by open spaces, notably Hanwell Green and Manor Court Green.</p> <p>In terms of change, the area has been subject to on-going small scale, but incremental, changes but this is not as significant as in other CAs and the general fabric has been maintained overall.</p>
Meeting with Conservation Area Panel	<p>The CA Panel have raised the following issues:</p> <p>General issues and areas of concern in Hanwell:</p> <p>A. Green open space - part of the special character of most of our CAs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General eroding of green open space through side and rear extensions, paving over front gardens and garden developments. 2. Loss of front hedges due to crossovers for parking. 3. Street trees disappearing. 4. Large blocks of flats - along the Uxbridge Road and elsewhere with little or no amenity space - changing the general appearance of Hanwell from Village. 5. Generally creeping reduction of open space and downgrading nature conservation value of the areas (Hanwell Hootie on Brent Meadow, Ken and C Cemetery, garden reductions). <p>B. Generally residents do not value Conservation Area status – they wish to develop their properties with large side and rear extension, roof extensions, basements, at times with a larger footprint than main dwellings, off road parking in front garden and another house in garden if possible - they wish to increase the size and value of their properties</p>

- C. Local residents do not want to be a member of the Conservation Area Panel – attempts to find additional panel members who have a concern for the preservation and enhancement of the conservation areas have been unproductive.
- D. Keeping an eye on and responding to applications in all the conservation areas in Hanwell is impossible for two people.
- E. Planning officers and their managers fail to respond to any enquiries from the panel and seems to have no concept of working with the conservation panel.
- F. We have no idea how the planning department is organised – e.g. are their teams with team leaders for specific parts of the Borough (east, west or ward based).
- G. We often don't get consulted about developments within Hanwell e.g. concerning listed buildings in Hanwell which might not be in a Conservation Area e.g. St Mellitus and unrelated bodies do get consulted - Pitshanger residents Association were consulted over planning application for St Mellitus Garden.
- H. On the other hand we sometimes get consulted about Canalside developments e.g. Greenford, Perivale etc. when we only cover Canalside up to Windmill Lane.
- I. Visible satellite dishes and front elevation drainage.
- J. Suggest most of our Hanwell Conservation areas should be walking areas with vehicle access only for residents. This would create easy and safe walking to green open space
- K. Uncontrolled advertising hoardings is a problem in many of the areas – this includes the Council (often on park gates and fences) who put up notifications and never take them down. Recent violation has been an enormous advert for West Ealing farmers market put on the railings on corner of Station Approach and Station road (Village Green CA and listed building area).

	<p><u>Hanwell Village Green</u></p> <p>Specific issues identified by the CA Panel for Hanwell Village Green CA:</p> <p>Key Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hanwell Station developments for Cross Rail – changes to North entrance with external lift shaft, another lift shaft in middle of tunnel and two service structures/cabinets at either side of south entrance. The highly visible and harmful structures on south side are solely down to cost. • New basements permitted in existing properties Manor Court and Campbell Roads and allowed in new development e.g. Golden Manor. • Visually intrusive side developments to properties • Development of Grade II listed building Crossways (134 Church Road) in progress with two additional dwellings in the garden fronting Cuckoo Lane (loss of open space). • Temporary large sports centre (Port-a-cabin) in car park of Brent Lodge Golf Course (eroding of open space). • Harmful conversion into flats of Victorian dwelling in front of North entrance of Hanwell Station. • CPZ throughout the area has created difficulties. <p>Changes to Conservation Area Boundary. None identified.</p> <p>Additional Planning controls. Triangular Hanwell Village Green needs additional protection – possibly through an Article 4 Direction plus additional tree planting in the area to maintain green appearance.</p>
<p>CA Boundary Changes</p>	<p><u>Boundary changes</u></p> <p>The previous Appraisal (2008) recommended the inclusion of 15-27 Campbell Rd, a cohesive row of 1930s terraced housing – this was subsequently agreed post-appraisal and is now included within the CA boundary.</p> <p>The strategic review has identified further potential boundary changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 116a, 116b, 116c, 118a, 118, 120, 120a Church Road - 7 modern houses included just within CA boundary, on the site of former larger inter-war houses/bungalows. Built c. 2000. Query whether these should be included. Design attempts to relate to Victorian architecture but form of houses doesn't sit comfortably within CA.

- **35-37 Manor Road**- post 1930s – inter war housing- query whether these should be included within CA boundary when house opposite of earlier period is excluded (32 Golden Manor- 1910-1930).

It is recommended that 116a, 116b, 116c, 118a, 118, 120, 120a Church Road and 35-37 Manor Road are removed from CA boundary.



Consideration was also given to **removing modern apartment blocks** from the CA, notably along **Manor Court Road** which contains:

- Brentmead Close (modern 2 storey brown brick maisonettes infill c. 1985),
- Hightrees Court on northern side of Manor court Rd. 4 storey flats – similar to Brentmead but earlier.
- Lime Terrace- modern infill flats.

However, the removal from the CA boundary of these infill developments would result in a very irregular boundary line at the geographical heart of the CA, which could compromise the wider CA designation. **It is recommended that no changes are made to the boundary in this regard.**

	<p>The potential to extend the CA boundary further south along Church Road was also considered as these contain some good examples of late Victorian architecture, especially the group of 51-65 Church Road. However, this area is interspersed with some later properties (e.g. 67 Church Rd and 32 Golden Manor on west side) and less impressive houses on eastern side and further down towards junction with Campbell Rd. On balance, therefore it is recommended that there is no change to the southern boundary at Church Road (although it is recommended that the group of 51-65 Church Road is added to the list of group/façade value- see section below).</p> <p>The potential to remove the north-western section of Church Road from the CA was also considered. This area contains housing of not very significant intrinsic architectural value from across the C.20 period (early, interwar and 1970s/80s). However, their domestic scale, cohesiveness and uniformity, together with the historical significance of this semi-rural area, gives the area some special interest. On balance, therefore it is recommended that there is no change to the north western boundary at Church Road.</p>
Key unlisted Buildings	<p>This CA Appraisal (2008) identifies positive buildings together with listed and locally listed buildings on the Townscape Appraisal Map (on page 35).</p> <p>The map shows that there are only two locally listed buildings within the CA:</p> <p>122-124 Elm Grove, Church Road- <i>Georgian Manor House which has been converted into a block of flats. brick built with stucco frontage, complete with ground and second floor cornices, projecting fluted drip lintels to windows, recessed entrance with steps to entrance doors to raised ground floor and upper storeys, slate mansard roof behind parapets. Ground floor projecting bay on southern elevation (windows replaced with Georgian style casement windows, with outward opening top lights).</i> It is recommended that further investigation is carried out to see if this building is worthy of statutory listing. The interior will be partially altered due to flat conversions, but the exterior remains intact. (LLR0277, LLR0278).</p> <p>Positive contributors</p> <p>The CA Appraisal Map identifies several buildings as positive contributors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-27, 2-20, 37-41 (odd), 48 and 50 Manor Court Road; • 3-25 (odd) and 2-10 (even) Golden Manor;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2-22 (even) and 1-7 (odd) Campbell Road; • 15-27 Campbell Road (just outside CA); • 81-95 (odd) Church Road; • 25-33 (odd) Cuckoo Lane; • 136, 97, 95, 101, 103, 178-182 (even) Church Road. <p>These all remain valid as positive contributors and no changes are recommended to the existing list.</p> <p>As part of the strategic review, the following buildings have also been identified as contributing positively to the area:</p> <p>80-84 Church Rd- Outside the CA. But distinctive red brick 3 storey flatted building with white stucco. 1890-1910. Replacement windows detract but otherwise original features retained. It is recommended that this is added to the local list.</p> <p>51-65 Church Rd- western section of road outside CA. The uniformity of these town houses and attractive detailing such as balconies above front doors. 1870-1890. Older than houses directly opposite on either side of road-It is recommended that these are included on the list of buildings of façade/group value.</p> <p>136 Church Road – former lodge to The Grove house – dates back to pre: 1870. Single storey slate roofed property adjacent to The Green at entrance to Golf Pavillion. This is identified as a positive contributor but given its distinctiveness, prominent location on The Green and its historical association with The Grove (former large house pre-1870), it is recommended that this is added to the local list.</p> <p>Railway viaduct at junction of Alwyne Rd and Golden Manor- framed by arches. An impressive structure and landmark, officially called Hanwell Small Viaduct Bridge. Possibly by Brunel as per the Wharnccliffe Viaduct (1836/37) to the west (Churchfields CA) or later c.1870s, as part of the widening of the tracks and rebuilding of Hanwell station to the east. In any event it is recommended that it is added to the local list.</p>
<p>Threats and Negative factors from last appraisal</p>	<p>The CA Appraisal (2008) identified the following threats and negative features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent modern infill development has failed to reflect quality of historic development – resulted in gaps and fractures in otherwise cohesive street scene- examples given include Hightrees Court, Brent Mead Close, Lime Terrace, Brierly Court,

Spring Court and Madge Hill. Also just outside CA – eastern end of Golden Manor-Testwood Court, Golden Court and Blagden Court [Agree, but these were built some time ago and not a lot can be done now- to exclude these from CA would just create an untidy and patchy boundary and if these buildings were to be redeveloped in future, retaining them within CA boundary would ensure high quality replacements. Where they are located on the edge of the CA, these have been considered for removal- see section on boundary changes].

- 134 Church Road- listed grade II- [was on the Heritage at Risk register at that time but has subsequently had planning permission for a redevelopment scheme- currently under construction and therefore technically no longer at risk].
- Street paving poor in a number of places – [no evidence that this has significantly worsened since 2008].
- Badly cropped or unmaintained street trees (no evidence that this has significantly worsened since 2008).
- Uncordinated and inappropriately designed street furniture [no evidence that this has significantly worsened since 2008- reproduction Victorian lamp standards (including swan neck) are appropriate and should be retained and repainted]
- Swathes of hard surfacing at entrance/car park to Golf Course are detrimental to Hanwell Green and CA in general [Agree to some extent, although car park is set well back from the Green and not highly visible, although it could be softened by additional landscaping]
- Uncordinated street furniture north of the Green at entrance to Golf Club [not entirely sure what this is referring to - there is a largish sign for the Golf course at golf course entrance but no significant impact]
- Inappropriate and oversized extensions, rear and side and roof extensions [a few examples found of these post 2008, including a few hip to gable roof extensions, but not a significant number]
- Insertion of dormer windows and rooflights of inappropriate design in front roof slopes [dormers are a recurring problem in many CAs but less evidence of it being a significant issue in this CA- the issue of rooflights remains an on-going issue, conservation rooflights are deemed more acceptable- need further guidance in all Management Plans on what is acceptable].
- Inappropriate window replacement, and removal/changes to window patterns and glazing divisions, and alterations to porches [yes, quite a lot of examples of inappropriate PVC-U

replacement including on oriel and gable windows but a significant amount was done pre-2008. Clarity and guidance needed generally across CAs about PVC-U replacements. Some enclosed porches coupled with neo-Georgian style doors detract]

- Removal of historic features such as finials, decorative ridge tiles or terracotta floor tiles [Yes very few examples of terracotta floor tiles left, although several examples seen of surviving finials and decorative ridge tiles- need to be retained- stronger reference in management plan]
- Removal of hedges, trees and other planting of significance [some loss of hedges along with boundary walls evident but not significant given relatively less pressure on street parking in this area coupled with narrow depths of front gardens in many cases]
- Street trees in need of selective management [not clear what is meant here- doesn't seem to be a significant problem particularly in the more rural part of the CA where there are less of them]
- Lowering or altering chimney stacks [not much recent evidence seen of this but again should be covered in management plan]
- Repointing or painting of brick or tile [not much recent evidence seen of this but again could be covered in management plan]
- Replacement of cast iron rainwater goods with plastic [not much recent evidence seen of this but again could be covered in management plan]
- Modern lifestyle products- Satellite dishes, security cameras, floodlights, metal bars and grilles on windows [not much recent evidence seen of this but again could be covered in management plan]
- Removal of front boundary walls and piers and hard surfacing of front gardens [see above under hedges]
- Inappropriate boundary features such as modern fences [a few examples of where fencing is need of attention/replacement but few examples of modern fencing found over and above those mentioned in 2008 Appraisal]
- A few privately-owned boundaries at western end of Church Road require improvement [not a significant issue].

The strategic review has also picked up the following issues:

- Untidy state of garages and fencing between 50 Manor Court Road- needs some kind of directive to spur improvement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor state of Golf Club garage store buildings on norther side of Church Rd detract • Porches – some enclosed porches coupled with neo-Georgian style doors detract. • Some PVC-U soffits detract. • Some conversion into several flats, many long-standing. Associated features such as bins etc. not as severe as other CAs.
<p>Gaps sites and capacity for change</p>	<p>The previous appraisal (2008) identified little capacity for major change, and that generally remains the case.</p> <p>However, the introduction of Crossrail at Hanwell station may increase pressure for development opportunities in area, particularly to the south of the railway. Rail improvements could in future also lead to increased rents for the railway arch spaces and consequently they may be left vacant.</p> <p>Listed Hanwell Station (1875-77)- currently undergoing works as part of the delayed Cross Rail scheme; the Elizabeth line is due to open in 2021.</p> <p>Hanwell Station is currently included in Historic England’s Heritage at Risk Register:</p> <p><i>Circa 1875-77 with important station canopies and ironwork especially on the central platform. It is the least altered example remaining of the general station rebuilding of the 1870s. The timber platform structures have had some repairs; however, the buildings remain underused. Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent applications have been submitted for step-free access to the station platforms as part of the Crossrail development. Additionally a station refurbishment project to bring the station buildings back into use and for further conservation works is being planned for 2019.</i></p> <p>Its condition was described as Fair and Priority C- Fair- slow decay, no solution agreed. The assessment will need to be updated following the completion of on-going works. It is recommended that the current Heritage at Risk listing remains until works have been completed and building re-assessed, but the priority category should now be changed to Priority E- ‘Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; or functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented’</p>

The forecourt area could certainly be improved/enhanced as part of building's curtilage.

Development sites that have come forward since last CA Appraisal (2008):

- **2 A Campbell Rd** (Fern Bank). PP/2014/6371 dated 13.05.2016 for the 'Replacement of a two storey, with habitable loft, detached dwelling house with associated access, refuse storage, cycle storage and landscaping including formation of hardstanding (following demolition of existing house c.1960s).' 2014 application refused on parking and conservation grounds but allowed on appeal (Ref: APP/A5270/W/16/31623).
- **Crossways, 134 Church Road** (St. Vincent's Lodge) Listed Georgian house on prominent position on triangular green at top of Church Rd. Identified in last Appraisal (2008) as at risk, now works on-going to restore and extend building Ref. No: 161288LBD (2017). The listing in EH Heritage at Risk Register identifies the building as being in very bad condition and with an immediate risk of further deterioration or loss of fabric. It is recommended that the building remains on the Heritage at Risk list until works have been completed and buildings are back in use. In the meantime, the priority category should be changed to Priority E- 'Repair scheme in progress and (where applicable) end use or user identified; or functionally redundant buildings with new use agreed but not yet implemented'

As noted in the CA Appraisal (2008), the CA includes several modern residential blocks which detract from the area both inside and just outside the CA:

- Brentmead Close- modern 2 storey brown brick flats infill – clearly alien to historic fabric
- Hightrees Court on northern side of Manor court Rd. 4 storey flats – similar to Brentmead but earlier.
- Lime Terrace- yet more modern infill off Manor Court Rd.
- Oakley Close (1-10 visible). Described in CA Appraisal as one of several mediocre infill developments that fail to replicate the quality of the CA. c.1980s/1990s.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brierley Court on right hand side- 3 storey modern flatted development looks out of place in this semi-rural area • Spring Court – modern post 1930 flats- on site of former large house (The Spring). • Blagdon Court and Testwood Court–modern 3 storey flatted development, in Golden Manor- both outside CA. <p>However, there are also some recent examples of some smaller scale contemporary infills, which are generally more sympathetic in scale and materials to surroundings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 124a Church Road- modern redevelopment of older building site (possibly a coach house or barn). Interesting clock towers. • 130-132 Church View – former house on site (Park House) but reasonably sympathetic to area in terms of scale and materials. • 42 Manor Court Rd- modern infill house but does contrast with more articulated neighbouring post 1930 houses. <p>There are no current Local Plan site allocations in the CA.</p>
Public Realm issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manor Court Green and the Village Green provide the two open spaces within the CA. Connolly Dell (just outside in Churchfields CA) is also visible. Generally, well maintained. The CA Appraisal (2008) noted that the access way to Manor Court Green was unattractive but it seems fine now. • Brent Valley Golf Course to north is included within CA boundary- substantial area of formal/informal open space leading to Brent River Park. Contributes to rural setting and open character of the CA. The Grove- substantial house (pre-1870) on what is now golf course has since been demolished. CA Appraisal (2008) notes that tarmac surface of entrance to golf carpark (see below) detracts from CA. Also, street furniture in this area)- see section on threats and negative features. • Mature trees on southern edge of golf course – well maintained landscaping area that adds to character of CA.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor state of single storey buildings on northern side of Church Road (presumably storage buildings used by the Golf Course) detracts from the area. • Untidy state of garages and fencing between 50 Manor Court Road.
<p>Management Plan</p>	<p>The Management Plan (2008) contains the usual generic guidance in relation to roof extensions, rooflights, tiles, chimneys, dormer windows and doors, brickwork, front and side plots, open space, extensions, outbuildings, urban density, traffic, satellite dishes, trees, public realm and shopfronts.</p> <p>This needs to be supplemented by further design guidance (see below), including on PVC-U windows. The planning and design issues raised in this report will be addressed as part of a new generic management plan and specific design guidance for the Hanwell Village Green CA.</p> <p>The CA Panel has only two members, yet it covers seven CAs in the Hanwell Area. They are clearly under resourced and need some assistance to effectively oversee all of the Hanwell CAs. This should be addressed by the Council and CA Forum, with a drive to recruit new members from the area. This could entail linking in with resident associations in the area, Hanwell Friends groups via Facebook and Hanwell Community Centre. This matter is also addressed in the overall Key Issues and Recommendations report.</p>
<p>Article 4 Directions</p>	<p>The Management Plan (2008) made no specific recommendations for an Article 4 Directions, although it said they could be considered for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building extensions disrupting the continuity of the streetscape • Bulky dormers windows disrupting the roofscape • Loss of traditional windows and doors together with alteration to characteristic glazing divisions • Loss of front garden trees and hedges together with loss of or alteration to front boundary walls and characteristic brick piers to accommodate cars • Hard surfacing of front gardens and vehicle cross over to accommodate car parking • Clutter around buildings associated with the subdivision of large houses into flats: gas meters, waste bins, letterboxes and doorbells/ intercoms, satellite dishes • Replacement or alteration to traditional brick and tile finishes.

	<p>However, the CA Appraisal (2008) noted that the Victorian and Edwardian properties generally are very cohesive and have been relatively immune from the rash of inappropriate minor development that has plagued some of the conservation areas in the Borough. That remains the case today and the strategic review has not identified a significant deterioration in any of the above issues to warrant the introduction of an Article 4 Direction at this time, although this should of course be kept under review.</p>
Other Controls/ Guidance	<p>It is recommended that further design guidance is produced. This should include both specific guidance relating to the local vernacular of the Hanwell Village CA. Generic guidance on the use of PVC-U windows and doors to provide clearer guidance on appropriate replacements and guidance to landlords on conversions and HMOs would also be helpful. These will be addressed in the new generic management plan and specific design guidance for the Hanwell Village Green CA.</p>
Planning Data	<p>Between 2007 and 2019, the levels of planning applications received averaged 26 per annum (Rank 16). 75% of applications were approved- which is the above average for all CAs. 15 appeals were lodged, with the majority (13) dismissed. In terms of enforcement activity, 5 cases per annum on average were investigated, with the main issues being operational development (i.e. where works began before planning permission was drafted or after the expiry of the planning permission).</p>

RM 22.7.20

Hanwell Village Green CA

By type:

Hanwell Village Green	2007	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Grand Total
ALL TYPES	27	9	29	37	35	25	47	36	1	14	39	42	341
TEL								1					1
CND	2	6	5	10	4	1	3	3		3	5	7	49
CPE/CPL/PRA	2		2	2	2	3	2	2		1	1	2	19
FULL	10	1	9	14	15	9	14	11		4	4	8	99
HH										3	12	10	25
LBC	1		3	1		2	2	2		1	1	2	15
CAC	1		1	1	2		1						6
VAR/NMA				1			1	3			1	2	8
TPO/TPC/PTC	11	2	9	8	12	10	24	14	1	2	15	11	108

By Decision:

Hanwell Village Green	2007	2008	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Grand Total
APPROVED/ NO OBJ	8	7	11	17	16	7	17	10	1	6	13	16	129
APP with COND	7	2	10	12	9	11	19	16		4	21	16	127
PD/PA	1		2	2		2	2	2		1	1	2	15
REFUSED	10		5	4	9	1	3	4		3	2	5	46
WITHDRAWN	1		1	2	1	4	6	4				2	21
APPEAL ALLOWED							1 WITH COSTS			1 with conditions			2
APPEAL DISMISSED	4		3		4	1					1		13

Enforcement Cases:

Hanwell Village Green	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Grand Total
ALL CASES	3	7		1	6	5	14	4	3	7	4	6	4	64
Advert Contr.								1					1	2
Amenity Issue		1					3	1						5
Change of Use	2	1				1			1			3		8
Enquiry										2	1	2		5
Multiple				1										1
Not in acc. w/p					2	1	1			1	1		1	7
Op. Dev.	1	3			1	2	9	1	1	1	2	1	1	23
Tree Cont.		2			2			1		3			1	9
Unknown					1	1	1		1					4

KEY:

Application types:

ADVERT:	Advertisement Consent
TEL:	Telecommunications Notification
CND:	Discharge of Conditions
CPE/CPL/PRA:	Certificate of proposed/ Lawful use/ Prior Approval
FULL:	Full Planning Permission
SCO/EIA/RMS:	Scoping Opinion/ EIA Application/ Reserved Matters
HH:	Householder Planning Permission
LBC/LBD:	Listed Building Consent/ Demolition
CAC:	Conservation Area Consent
VAR/NMA/COU:	Variation/ Non-Material Amendment/ Change of Use
TPO/TPC/PTC:	Works to a tree/ Tree Preservation Order

Decision types:

PD/PA:	Prior Approval/ Permitted Development/ Deemed Consent
--------	---

Enforcement breaches:

Advert Cont.:	Advert Contravention
Breach of Cs.:	Breach of Conditions
Constr. Det. Dw.:	Construction of detached residential dwelling
Dem. In CA:	Demolition in Conservation Area
Listed B. Contr.:	Listed Building Contravention

Not in acc. w/p:

Op. Dev.:

Use anc. out.:

Tree Cont.:

Not in accordance with planning permission

Operational Development

Use of Ancillary outbuilding as separate dwelling

Tree Contravention

DRAFT