

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 March 2017

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/16/3165584
27 Overstone Road, London W6 0AD

- 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 O Majeed against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref: 2016/04548/FUL, dated 16 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear extension at first and second floor levels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Bradmore Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace Victorian property, converted into four self-contained flats, located on the western side of Overstone Road. The site is located within the Bradmore Conservation Area (the CA) and is predominately residential in character.
 4. No character appraisal is available for the CA. Nonetheless, I consider that the significance of the CA is derived from the visual cohesion of the terraces. Variations in the style and scale of dwellings exist, but it appears that the Victorian properties generally possess two-storey outriggers.
 5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect, national policy on heritage assets is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
 6. The appeal site has undergone previous extensions at the rear, including a mansard roof addition. Given the location of the appeal site at the end of the terrace, the bulk and mass of the existing extensions appear as dominating additions to the site.
-

7. It is noted that the appeal scheme is an amendment to a previous scheme at the site which was refused planning permission¹ and dismissed at appeal². The proposal has been subsequently amended, with the third-floor addition being removed from the scheme. However, the increase in depth of the proposed extension would represent an unduly dominant and incongruous feature. As such, despite being of matching materials, it would fail to represent a subservient addition and so would not integrate satisfactorily with the host building or the existing terrace of which it forms a part.
8. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to unacceptably diminish the character, appearance and integrity of the host building with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. As such, the proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bradmore CA but would harm it.
9. The magnitude of harm identified in respect of the designated heritage asset as a whole is less than substantial in the context of paragraph 134 of the Framework. However, I do not consider that the arguments advanced in favour of allowing the appeal amount to public benefits that would outweigh the substantial weight I must attach to the designated heritage asset conservation.
10. Due to the harm identified in relation to the CA, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It follows, therefore, that the proposal would also be contrary to Policies 7.1, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (as amended 2016), Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy Local Development Framework 2011 and Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan 2013. When taken together these policies seek, amongst other things, to promote the conservation and enhancement of the Borough's heritage assets. They also require that new development should be of a high quality design in order to respond positively to the local context and character which this scheme does not.

Other Matters

11. Reference has been made to the extensions and permissions granted at 13, 14 and 17 Kilmarsh Road which are near to the appeal site. However, I have little information relating to the particular circumstances of these developments and permissions and, as such, a comparison is not possible. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal before me on its individual merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Helen Cassini

INSPECTOR

¹ Council reference 2016/00775/FUL

² Appeal reference APP/H5390/W/16/3152273