
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2016

by David Walker MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 22nd December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/16/3158312

85 and 85a Goldhawk Road, London W12 8EG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bhupendra Patel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2015/06087/FUL, dated 24 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is alterations of the basement and ground floor levels of existing shop, part single, part three storey rear extension, mansard roof extension in connection with relocation of existing 2 bed flat to the rear of the site and provision of 3 new studio single occupancy flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located in a short terrace fronting onto Goldhawk Road. The terrace is bookended by a large block of apartments at Brackenbury Square and a former public house at No 77. With the exception of Brackenbury Square it falls within the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area where I have a duty to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the designated area.
4. Recent development at Brackenbury Square and No 77¹ has resulted in the buildings at both ends of the block being significantly higher than the appeal building. My attention has also been brought to the mansard roof forms of the neighbouring block between No 75 and Goldhawk Road Station.
5. However, while No 77 and Brackenbury Square are taller than the proposed mansard roof extension they are located at landmark corner positions and are one-off building designs. Mansard roofs are the predominant and existing roof form of the neighbouring block. Conversely, the appeal property falls within a short row of buildings of similar design and appearance with only the parapet of their roofs visible at the street level.

¹ Planning application Ref: 2014/03021/FUL

6. In this context the introduction of the additional height and differing form of the mansard roof proposed would appear out of character with the unity of the existing roof shapes of the historic frontage. I agree with the findings of the Inspector in a previous appeal² at No 83 that the lack of roof extensions in the block is a key consideration.
7. The appellant has offered to remove the three storey rear extension of the proposals. However, this would be positioned between projecting elements of adjacent buildings and while visible from the rear would not be prominent. It would not reduce the harm of the mansard roof when seen from Goldhawk Road. In any event such an amendment to the scheme would materially change that which was consulted upon.
8. The harm I have identified would therefore fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would accordingly lead to conflict with paragraphs 132-134 of the National Planning Policy Framework that seek to ensure that great weight is given to a designated heritage asset's conservation. Although the harm I have identified would be less than substantial harm, there are no identifiable public benefits weighing in favour of the scheme.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area. Such harm brings the proposal into conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan 2013 (the DMLP) which require that development preserves or enhances the borough's conservation areas in order to produce attractive and distinctive areas.
10. The proposal would also conflict with Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015 which require development to be of the highest architectural quality, and Policy DM G3 of the DMLP which requires extensions to be compatible with the original building.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and with regard to the development plan read as a whole, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Walker

INSPECTOR

² Appeal Ref APP/H5390/A/10/2124515