The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2021

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/20/3258701
31 Hurlingham Gardens, London, SW6 3PH

- 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 Andrea Casulli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
- The application Ref 2020/01351/FUL, dated 1 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
- The development proposed is extension of existing single storey side bay to form two storey side bay. Installation of a rooflight in the roof to the rear addition. Alterations to the fenestration of the rear elevation at Ground, First & Second Floor Level. Re tile of existing whole roof.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension of existing single storey side bay to form two storey side bay. Installation of a rooflight in the roof to the rear addition. Alterations to the fenestration of the rear elevation at Ground, First & Second Floor Level. Re tile of existing whole roof at 31 Hurlingham Gardens, London, SW6 3PH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/01351/FUL, dated 1 June 2020, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: Location Plan; 0748-01 Rev F; 0748-02 Rev B; 0748-03 Rev B; 0748-04.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hurlingham Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached dwelling on a corner plot within the Hurlingham Conservation Area (CA) at the junction with Edenhurst Avenue. Several alterations are proposed. The Council's concern is that a replacement bay window on the side elevation facing Edenhurst Avenue would harm the

appearance of the building and therefore also harm the character and appearance of the CA.

4. Common features that define the character of buildings within this part of the CA are on the front elevations of houses, including the appeal property. They include 2 storey bays with steep pitched gable roofs, open porches with decorative features, and window surrounds comprising a mix of brick and decorative mouldings.

5. Differences in detailing on houses also define the character of the area as highlighted in the Hurlingham Conservation Area Character Profile, referred to by the appellant. These include varied porch designs, first floor iron work balconies above some porches, and the variety of front boundary treatments. Differences in detailing on the side walls of houses at corner plots close to the appeal site, at 15 and 17 Hurlingham Gardens, also add to the area's character. No 17 has two 2 storey bays on its side elevation one of which is on the rear wing. No 15 only has one 2 storey bay on its gable end. No 15 has a lean-to extension on its rear wing and an external exposed brickwork chimney breast on the gable. No 17 and the appeal property have neither of these features.

6. The side elevation of the appeal property comprises the gable end and a rear wing. The gable end has a two storey projecting bay with a hipped tiled roof. The rear wing has a single storey bay. The proposed development would extend this up to the first floor and would be identical to the gable bay.

7. The proposal would provide an element of symmetry in terms of matching the existing two storey bay. As such it would not appear discordant or dominant whilst retaining the distinctive differences with other houses' side elevations which are characteristic of the street scene. It would not affect features on the front elevation of the house which contribute most to its character and appearance and that of the CA. Overall. I consider that the proposed first floor bay window would preserve the character and appearance of the building and wider CA and would comply with policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which seek good design that is compatible with the scale and character of existing development and conserves the significance of the borough's historic environment.

Conditions

8. The 3 year period in which the planning permission may be implemented is a statutory requirement. Conditions should also be imposed to require the use of matching materials in the interests of appearance and to list the plans in the interest of certainty.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR