
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 September 2020

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/20/3252748

Ground Floor, 57 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 Miguel Guillamon Gil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/00500/FUL, dated 19 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a wood bike shed with space for one bike.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. The former, however, adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on that basis. The bike shed was already in place at the site at the time of my visit and appeared to broadly accord with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the bike shed on the character and appearance of the Bradmore Conservation Area (the conservation area), within which the appeal site is located.

Reasons

4. The terrace within which the appeal property sits is of attractive appearance. The small and largely open front yards along the western side of the street serve to frame and grant prominence to the mainly uniform scale, materials, form and detailing of the terraced properties which are defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.
5. The bike shed is situated at the front of the property and is highly visible in views from the north and south along Overstone Road by reason of its notable projection above the brick and railing front boundary wall.
6. Given its degree of visibility within the street, the appeal proposal forms a rather bulky and uncomfortable structure which interrupts the views of the terrace from Overstone Road. As a result, the bike shed detracts from its appearance and therefore detracts from the heritage significance of the conservation area.

7. The harm to the significance of the conservation area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
8. Such benefits in this instance would be environmental, through the encouragement of the use of a bicycle that may arise as the result of the availability of a safe and convenient storage area. I note that the Framework at paragraphs 8 and 148 supports moving to a low carbon economy.
9. While I acknowledge these environmental benefits, they would nonetheless be modest bearing in mind that the proposal relates to storage space for 1 bicycle. Given the degree of harm that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to conservation areas, the benefits identified are not therefore sufficient to outweigh this harm. Further, there is no evidence to confirm that it would not be possible to safely store a bicycle elsewhere on the property.
10. The development would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) and key principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which amongst other things require that development proposals protect heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. Other examples of bike sheds within the area have been brought to my attention. However, none of the examples cited in detail appear to share the exact same circumstances.
12. Some of the example properties appear to have larger front gardens where a bike shed would form a less prominent feature. Other examples appear to show bike sheds which are at or nearer to the height of the front boundary treatment which would serve to limit their impact. The evidence indicates that not all of these examples are within conservation areas. As a result of these matters, I attach limited weight to these examples and they do not justify the appeal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR