

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/16/3157716 66 Goldhawk Road, London W12 8HA

- 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 Steve Simmonds against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2015/05411/FUL, dated 16 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 1 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is refurbishment and extension of the existing first and second floor residential accommodation over ground floor commercial premises to provide bin and cycle storage at ground floor level, retaining the commercial space and changing 4 x studios into 2 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed self contained dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans were submitted with the appeal. I consider that the plans are materially different from those formally assessed by the Council. Thus all parties may not be aware of them nor had the opportunity to consider them. Therefore in the interests of natural justice, I must determine the appeal on the basis of the original plans formally assessed by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area including its effect on the Hammersmith Grove Conservation Area (HGCA) and the Coningham and Lime Grove Conservation Area (CLGCA);
 - the living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to internal living space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a three storey end terrace building on the corner of Goldhawk Road and Lime Grove. It is mainly constructed of buff brickwork and has a flat roof and parapet wall detail.
 5. The buildings on Goldhawk Road are of different heights and mixed character, with mainly commercial uses at street level, giving a varied character and
-

- appearance. However, the buildings on Lime Grove, particularly to the east side are mainly residential properties, comprising mainly terraces of a similar height with a more formal character and appearance.
6. The appeal building and the building on the opposite corner of the Goldhawk Road and Lime Gove, frame the entrance to Lime Grove, and the CLGCA. Whilst the appeal building is not within the CA it would be directly adjacent to it and widely visible from within it.
 7. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would incorporate matching traditional details and would be constructed from matching materials. I also note the appeal site frontage to Lime Grove and the pavement adjacent to Lime Grove is currently of relatively poor appearance.
 8. However, the proposed three storey wedge shaped side extension would introduce a significant bulk of development and result in awkward wedge shaped building directly adjacent to the Lime Grove footway. This would contrast with the formal character of the properties on Lime Grove and thus would be an incongruous feature of the Lime Grove street scene which would erode the space at the entrance to Lime Grove and restrict views into the CLGCA from Goldhawk Road.
 9. However, the proposed three storey side extension would not be visually prominent from within the HGCA. Furthermore, the proposed roof addition would be finished in materials which would match other roof additions nearby and would be set back and angled away from the edges of the building, such that when viewed in the context of other roof additions nearby, it would not appear overly prominent or out of place.
 10. However, whilst I find the setting of the HGCA would not be harmed and no harm to the character and appearance of the area arising from the proposed roof addition, I find that the proposed three storey side extension would harm the character and appearance of the area, and the setting of the CLGCA.
 11. In the context of the Framework the harm to the significance of the CLGCA would be less than substantial and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would provide new homes in a location which is well served by services and public transport. It would also address the poor appearance to the Lime Grove frontage at ground floor level. However, these advantages are relatively small in scale and would not outweigh the great weight that should be given to the designated heritage asset's preservation.
 12. Thus, for the reasons given, I find the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and is therefore in conflict with the development plan. It would specifically conflict with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan (2013) (DMLP) which seek to ensure good design and the conservation of heritage assets.

Living conditions

13. Policy DM A2 of the DMLP makes clear that new dwellings should meet minimum space standards set out in Policy 3.5 of the London Plan – The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations Since

2011(2016) (LP). These standards are consistent with the Technical housing standards – National described space standard (THS)¹.

14. Proposed flat 4 would fall short of the required standard for a three bedroom, four person dwelling. Those standards are minimum standards, thus, I am led to the conclusion that this unit of accommodation would result in a cramped internal living space. Whilst I note this unit of accommodation could be amended to comply with the minimum space standard by reducing the number of bed spaces, as I dismissing the appeal for other reasons I have not addressed this matter any further.
15. I therefore find that on the basis of the plans formally considered by the Council, proposed flat 4 would result in harmful living conditions for the future occupants with particular regard to internal space. Thus, the proposed development would not accord with the development plan and would specifically be in conflict with Policies DM A2 and DM A9 of the DMLP, Policy H3 of the CS and Policy 3.5 of the LP which aim to ensure good design and a good standard of living accommodation.

Other Matters

16. I note that the proposals were subject to lengthy pre application discussions. However, I have determined the appeal on its planning merits and found harm to the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of future occupiers.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons set out above and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR

¹ Technical housing standards – National described space standard, DCLG, March 2015