



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/22/3310627

40 Rylett Road, London W12 9ST

- 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 and Mrs T and R Brenninkmeijer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2022/01284/FUL, dated 3 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey side extension, including alterations to the boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a handsome, semi-detached, 2-storey house. It is located in a residential area comprising semi-detached, hipped roof houses of similar age, form and detailed design. This, together with the well-planted front gardens and street trees, gives the area a high degree of unity and forms a pleasant residential environment that makes a clear positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The property is situated on one corner of a crossroads formed by the junctions between Rylett Road, Binden Road and Ashchurch Terrace. The four properties next to the crossroads, namely 31, 33, 38 and 40 Rylett Road, all have their entrances in the flank elevations. These elevations were most likely identical when originally built and to a large degree this remains the case although No.38 has been rendered and lost a chimney and the portico to No.33 has been removed. These street-facing side elevations comprise two parts: the main part closest to the crossroads includes the entrances and has a decorative eaves above which is a hipped roof. The part furthest from the crossroads is simpler and, at Nos 31, 33 and 40, terminates at the top with a parapet. Nos 31, 33 and 38 all have small single-storey elements attached to latter parts of the flank elevations. However the main parts of the side elevations largely

retain their original form and the unity positively contributes to the character and appearance of the CA.

5. The appeal proposal would comprise the erection of a small single-storey addition to the side of the appeal property to provide a cloakroom. This would be smaller than the side additions attached to the sides of the neighbouring houses and its detailed design and materials would blend with those of the appeal property. However, the proposal would be attached to the main part of the side elevation close to the entrance portico, it would result in the loss of a small characterful window and, it would not follow the pattern of development established by the nearby additions. Due to this siting, the proposal would be an incongruous addition that would harm the appearance of the appeal property and its immediate surroundings.
6. For these reasons I conclude the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the host property and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It is therefore contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which, in summary, collectively require extensions to be compatible with the scale and character of existing development, neighbouring properties and their setting; respect and enhance townscapes; and conserve the significance of the historic environment by protecting heritage assets. There is also conflict with Key Principle CAG3 of the Council's Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which states that extensions should be sympathetic to the architectural character of the built context.
7. I recognise that the appeal property does not currently benefit from a ground floor toilet. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that this facility cannot be accommodated internally. As such I attribute limited weight to this matter.
8. Whilst the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA, the harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR