



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 September 2017

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3179662

221 Goldhawk Road, Ravenscourt Park, London W12 8ER

- 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 Richard Hennity against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2017/00131/FUL, dated 8 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a fourth storey addition to existing three storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area and its effect on the living conditions of the occupants of the neighbouring residential property, No 223 Goldhawk Road, with regard to outlook.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (the CA). This part of the CA is characterised by the period properties either side of Goldhawk Road which form distinct building groups that vary in their size and design. These groups, particularly along the south side of the road, follow uniform building lines and are typical of historical suburban London. The front elevations of these properties are largely unaltered. In marked contrast, the rear elevations comprise various alterations and extensions and do not reflect the rhythm and uniformity of the frontages.
4. The appeal property is a four-storey semi-detached villa that forms one half of a pair of similar semi-detached properties, which are on the Local Register as Buildings of Merit. The properties on either side of this small group are three-storey in height. There is an existing three-storey extension that extends almost the full width of the dwelling. The proposal would sit on top of this extension and would be approximately half its depth. When read in conjunction with the existing extension it would result in an excessively large bulk that would fail to appear subservient to the original dwelling. As a result of its width and height it would dominate the rear elevation, resulting in almost the complete loss of the original rear elevation of the dwelling, with only the coach house to the side remaining.

5. Whilst the extension would not be seen from Goldhawk Road, it would be clearly visible from Brading Terrace and, to a lesser extent, Wingate Road. I find therefore that the proposal would unacceptably dominate the rear elevation of the host dwelling and appear as an unduly prominent and incongruous feature in the CA.
6. I have had regard to the extensions to neighbouring properties in the vicinity, in particular Nos 227 and 229 Goldhawk Road. Whilst these extensions are high, they are not of the same size as the proposal and do not occupy almost the entire rear elevation of their host dwellings. I note that the floor area of the extension at No 229 is larger in comparison with its host dwelling than that proposed. However, its overall mass is broken-up through its different design approach. Consequently, they do not overly dominant the host dwelling to the same extent as the appeal proposal would when read in conjunction with the existing extension.
7. Paragraph 134 of the Framework confirms that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use.
8. I note that the reason for the extension is to allow the internal reconfiguration of the property due to its proximity to Goldhawk Road. Whilst the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, I do not consider that the identified needs of the appellant amounts to public benefit that would outweigh this harm.
9. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm, and therefore fail to preserve or enhance, the character or appearance of the CA. As such, it would be contrary to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy 2011, which seeks to ensure that development protects and enhances the character, appearance and setting of the borough's conservation areas. Furthermore, it would fail to comply with Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan (the LP) 2013, which seek to ensure that development should be subservient to the existing building and protect, restore or enhance the quality, character, appearance and setting of the borough's conservation areas. In addition, it would fail to comply with the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2013, which provides guidance on residential extensions and development in conservation areas.

Living Conditions

10. No 223 Goldhawk Road has second floor windows that are positioned within proximity of the proposed extension. The extension would exceed the height of these windows. However, notwithstanding its proximity, I do not consider that it would reduce the outlook from them to such an extent that it would result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure that would significantly harm the usability of the room that these windows serve and the living conditions of the occupants. I note that there are similarly positioned windows on the lower floors that are in proximity of the existing extension, which presumably the Council considered the outlook from them would not be unduly harmed when granting permission for the existing extension. The proposal would likely have

less of an effect on outlook as the proposed extension would be approximately half its depth.

11. I find therefore that the proposal would not have any significantly harmful effect on the occupants of the neighbouring residential properties. As such, it would comply with Policies DM G3 and DM A9 of the LP, which seek to promote good neighbourliness and protect residential amenities. Furthermore, it would comply with SPD Housing Policy 7 of the SPD, which provides guidance on protecting outlook from neighbouring windows.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposal would not significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. However, this absence of harm is a neutral effect and does not outweigh the harm I have identified with regard to the effect of the development on the CA.
13. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR