



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Zoe Raygen Dip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/19/3241515

221 Goldhawk Road, 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 and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2019/02332/FUL, dated 31 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 October 2019.
 - The proposed development is erection of a rear extension at second floor level over part of the existing back addition.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a three-storey, semi-detached property with lower-ground floor. The property has been subject to a substantial three-storey extension at the rear which extends the full-width of the principal rear façade, as well as a dormer extension within the rear roofslope. There are unobstructed views of the rear of the property from Wingate Road to the east and Brading Terrace to the west. The site lies within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (RSGCA), whose significance is largely derived from the architectural merit of its buildings and its varied and historic street layout. The appeal property is registered as a Building of Merit due to its townscape value.
 5. While the appeal property has been considerably extended at the rear, it remains unaltered at second-floor level where its original rear façade can still be seen. The retention of this part of the rear façade provides a clear visual differentiation between the original proportions of the host property and latter additions. As the proposal would extend the full width of the principal rear elevation and result in the complete loss of the original rear façade, the proportions of the appeal property would be overtly distorted to the detriment
-

of its character and appearance. Furthermore, in combination with the previous rear extensions, the width, height, depth and overall scale of the proposal would appear as an excessive and obtrusive addition that would fail to have an appropriately subordinate relationship to the appeal property. As the resulting rear façade would be highly prominent in public views, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character, appearance and significance of the RSGCA.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to various examples of development within the surrounding area. As the details and circumstances concerning Nos. 34 & 36 Ravenscourt Road are not before me to consider, I am unable to determine whether they provide any justifiable precedent for the proposal. Regardless, as these two properties are located around half a mile from the appeal site and relate to a distinctly different streetscene, they are not directly comparable to the proposal. Regarding the examples at Nos. 227 and 229 Goldhawk Road, I saw at my site visit that each property has visibly retained part of their original rear façade. In contrast, the proposed extension would completely obscure the rear façade of the appeal property in combination with existing with existing rear extensions. As such, these two examples are not comparable to the proposal.
7. Concerning the photograph of No. 245 Goldhawk Road submitted by the appellant, which I also saw on my site visit, I am unable to determine whether this example provides any justifiable precedent as the full details surrounding this development, such as application for, delegated report and decision notice, are not before me to consider. However, from the drawings provided, it appears to me that the approved scheme, referred to by the appellant, concerned a roof extension rather than any kind of rear extension. Regardless, each appeal must be considered on its own merits, and for reasons set out above I have found that the proposal would be unacceptable.
8. The appellant states that the proposal would only represent a 2% increase of the existing property's internal floor space. Nonetheless, this would not justify the proposal which would cause unacceptable harm for reasons set out above.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policies DC1 of the Local Plan (2018) and Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan, which state that development must respond to local character and be designed to the highest quality, Policy DC4 of the Local Plan (2018) which states that extensions must successfully integrate into the architectural design of the existing building, and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policy DC8 of the Local Plan (2018) and Key Principles AH2 and CAG3 of the Planning Guidance SPD (2018), which require that development must preserve and enhance the significance of heritage assets and protect the character and appearance of conservation areas. However, the proposal would not conflict with Key Principle BL2 of the Planning Guidance SPD (2018) as this relates specifically to the development of lightwells and basements and therefore is not relevant to this proposal.
10. The Council also refers to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in its Reason for Refusal. However, this merely states that there is a duty to ensure that special attention shall be paid to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. This has been carried out in the above assessment.

11. The harm that the proposed development would cause to the significance of the RSGCA would be less than substantial. However, there would be no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

12. I understand that the purpose of the proposed extension is to improve internal living arrangements. While I have some sympathy, these circumstances do not justify the proposal given the unacceptable level of harm that would result.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Zoe Raygen

INSPECTOR