



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/24/3355440

15 Binden Road, Hammersmith and Fulham, London W12 9RJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dominic Ross against the decision of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/00166/FUL.
 - The development is a bin & bike store in front garden.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. This appeal relates to development that has have already been carried out. The application is therefore retrospective, and I have considered the submission accordingly.
3. Subsequent to Council's decision, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (December 2024) (the Framework). I consider that there have been no major changes relevant to the main issues in this appeal. It will therefore not prejudice any party by making my decision with regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (the CA)

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a late 19th Century two storey plus basement mid-terraced house, with a paved front garden with dwarf wall topped with railings on the boundary to the highway. It is located in a street of similar terraced houses that provide for a high quality streetscape. The street is within the boundary of an extensive conservation area that includes Ravenscourt park and is located in that part of the CA that is made up of streets of similar 19th Century terraced houses that retain much of their original architectural details and features and that form a cohesive townscape. As such, the appeal dwelling contributes to the significance of the CA.

6. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
7. The weathered steel cycle and bin store with planter to top is approximately 1550mm tall and 930mm wide and sits to one side of the front garden and runs the full length of the boundary with the neighbouring terraced house. This is 145mm taller than the timber clad cycle and bin storage previously approved¹. The height of the development is greater than that of the front boundary wall, gate piers and railings, and there are other examples of taller side boundary treatments along the street. However, these are a mix of timber fences and hedges. The timber or plastic bin/cycle storage in front gardens in all of other properties appear to be significantly shorter in length and slightly shorter than the development, having subdued and contextual finishes that result in them harmonising with their host properties and the street scene.
8. The weathered steel used for the development is a high quality material, in regular use for contemporary structures and buildings, including planters. However, in the context of the Victorian terrace house and its neighbours in the street, it fails to reflect the materials used for buildings and garden structures in the street. This is accentuated by the colour/tone choice of the patinated finish, which contrasts significantly with its surroundings and results in an incongruous presence.
9. The incongruity of the weathered steel is exacerbated by the excessive height and width, of the development, which results in a visually dominating installation that fails to reflect the architectural expression of the appeal dwelling. This also results in the development appearing as dominating and unduly prominent within the streetscape, in extensive views along the street. As such, the development fails to reflect the high quality and coherence of the streetscape, detracting from the contribution that this and the appeal dwelling make to the significance of the CA. The presence of the planter top to the development does little to ameliorate this effect, whilst adding to its height.
10. For these reasons, the proposal does not accord with Key Principles CAG2 and CAG3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which seek development that is sympathetic to the character of their context and positively contribute to the townscape of conservation areas.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to weathered steel planter installations in the local area, although no details on their planning status has been provided. The one at Kinnear Road is located on the front boundary and is outside of the CA. The one at Rylett Crescent is within the CA but sits away from the front boundary in an enclosed part of the garden adjacent to the flank wall of a neighbouring property. Both are smaller installations than the appeal development and have significantly differing contexts to the appeal dwelling. As such, I have only afforded these limited weight in my considerations.
12. Whilst I appreciate the development provides for 3 secure cycle storage spaces and storage for recently issued larger bins for waste and recycling, the

¹ Planning Ref: 2021/01004/FUL

development, with the effects I have detailed above, is not the only way that such provision could be achieved.

13. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, as well as to the significance of the CA. This would conflict with Policies DC1, DC4, DC8 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan (2018). Collectively, these seek to ensure that development, is of high quality design, respects its townscape context and has due regard to the importance of preserving or enhancing the significance of heritage assets.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the streetscape of the local area is substantial, although the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework, great weight should be given to the conservation of such heritage assets.
15. The proposal provides for cycle storage, a healthy and sustainable transport choice for the occupants. Whilst this is a public benefit, this is relatively limited. I must also give considerable importance and weight to the effect on the significance of the CA. I consider that the benefits of the development do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
16. For the reasons given, and with regard to all other issues raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR