



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2021 by Max Webb BA (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/21/3268237

17 Hofland Road, London W14 0LN

- 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 Panayiotis Themistocli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2020/03073/FUL, dated 23 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2021.
 - The development is bicycle store located in front garden.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The original planning application was made retrospectively. The appeal has therefore been considered on the same retrospective basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is situated in Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area (CA), the special interest of which is primarily derived from built details, building materials and gardens. The appeal property forms part of the terrace on Hofland Road, which is acknowledged as a 'key view' in the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area Character Profile (2017), designating the houses on this street as buildings of merit, for reasons of consistent architecture and generous front gardens.
6. The cycle store takes up a significant amount of space in front of the property. Whilst it may not dominate the plot, it is larger and taller than the bins and garden furniture that are present in gardens along this street. In relation to the host dwelling it is subordinate, however in the context of the low boundaries and domestic gardens, the cycle store looks substantial. It therefore appears out of character with the street scene.

7. The cycle store is made from dark PVC-coated galvanised steel, which directly contradicts the London stock brick and white lower facades of the terrace. This choice of materials is not in-keeping with the host dwelling and the cycle store therefore appears intrusive. There are other cycle stores in the CA, including those installed by the local authority, however these are on different streets where the key characteristics is not derived from the front gardens to the same degree. The other example on the appeal street is constructed from different materials that better suit the mature greenery of the gardens and London stock brick of properties on this street.
8. From directly in front of the property the cycle store is somewhat hidden by the hedge. However, even if the intention is for this to be grown taller and denser, moving passed the front gate of the property enables clear views of the cycle store. Furthermore, due to the low walls and fences separating the gardens, the cycle store is visible from the neighbouring properties.
9. The cycle store interrupts the view in a relatively small part of the CA, and therefore the harm caused to the heritage asset is less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires, when this is the case, that the harm is to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The cycle store allows for storage of a sustainable form of transport for the host dwelling. However, there are other, less intrusive means of storing a bicycle. The Framework also requires that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset. In this case, the development only aids with providing means of sustainable transport for a single dwelling, and thus the public benefit does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It therefore does not accord with Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Local Plan (2018) which aim to ensure good design in terms of scale and materials, particularly in regard to conservation areas. It is also contrary to key principles CAG2, CAG3, AH2 and BM2 of the Hammersmith & Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which together seek for development to be sympathetic to existing character, harmonise with neighbours and avoid harm to heritage assets and buildings of merit.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal does not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR