



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 October 2023

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/23/3326411

29 Wandsworth Bridge Road, London SW6 2TA

- 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 Mrs S Kemppainen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2023/01173/FUL, dated 5 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "Reduce the height of the front boundary wall".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Studdridge Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a handsome terrace of 2-storey houses that faces Wandsworth Bridge Road, a busy tree-lined street. It is situated within the Studdridge Street Conservation Area (CA) and forms part of one of the many red brick, half-gabled terraces with paired arched recessed entrance porches which form a key constituent of the character and appearance of this part of the CA.
4. A tall, white-painted brick wall with railings above and piers to either end has been erected along the front boundary of the appeal property without planning permission. The proposal would comprise works to this wall to make it lower. The proposed wall would include railings along the top and piers to either end, essentially matching the design of the current wall but lower.
5. The proposed wall and railings would be taller than the original wall at the front of the appeal property and taller than the boundary walls at the fronts of the properties to either side, which do not feature railings above them. In addition, the overall height of the proposal – brickwork and railings – would be taller than all the front boundaries in the terrace, most of which are simple brick walls without railings or piers.

6. In the wider CA simple waist high brick front boundary walls are a key constituent of the character and appearance. Where taller brick walls or walls with railings and piers have been erected, most notably at 43, 45 and 47 Wandsworth Bridge Road, this has resulted in clear harm to the character and appearance of the street scene and the CA.
7. Due to its height and appearance the proposal would result in an overly prominent and incongruous front boundary that 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 (2023) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply encloses private space at the front of the appeal property its benefits solely relate to privacy and security for the property's occupiers. There are no public benefits associated with it.
8. For the reasons set out above the proposal is contrary to Policies DC1, DC4 and DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018) which, in summary, require development 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.

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