



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 April 2025

by **L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/25/3358913

3 Wood Lane, LONDON, W12 7DP

- 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 Lyupcho Velkov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref is 2024/01346/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Retrospective application for replacement of 4no. wooden white front windows to UPVC white windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2024, during the consideration of this appeal. Insofar as is directly relevant to the appeal, there are no substantive changes and no parties have been prejudiced as a result.
3. At the time of my site visit works had commenced at 3 Wood Lane. The works appear to have been carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; including the effect on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The site comprises a commercial unit on the southern end of Wood Lane and a residential maisonette located on the first and second floors. The surrounding area comprises a mix of commercial uses with residential accommodation above. The appeal site is situated adjacent to the Shepherd's Bush Conservation Area (CA).
6. The appeal property is part of a larger building with a neighbouring ground floor commercial unit and two-storeys of accommodation above. The building as a whole has an attractive sense of symmetry; the red-brick above the commercial units, along with a consistency of detailing such as the ground floor pilasters, string course and decorative parapet wall and finials create a sense of uniformity across the building when read as a whole. The majority of windows within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site are timber framed, many are sash windows. For these

reasons the building, including the appeal site, makes a positive contribution to the setting of the CA.

7. The proposal is for the replacement of four timber sash windows at first and second floor level with white UPVC windows. The replacement windows are sited across one half of the whole building and have larger, more bulky frames which have the effect of reducing the size of the openings and the amount of visible glazing. The replacement windows are visually different to those which remain on the other side of the host building and thus appear as a visually jarring and discordant feature which fails to reflect the materials and proportions of the host building.
8. When viewed in the context of the building as a whole, the replacement windows disrupt the overall cohesion and negatively impact the composition of the building; significantly reducing the attractive symmetry which is key to its character and appearance.
9. The replacement windows are also top hung and open outwards into the street. This style of opening further increases the prominence of the windows within the street scene and draws further attention to their incongruous nature. Consequently, the replacement windows appear as unsympathetic additions to the building which fail to respect the proportions, detailing and materials present at the host building and across the wider area.
10. I accept that the replacement windows match the location of their predecessors and also acknowledge that the replacement windows were required as the previous windows had deteriorated. However, in my view, it would be possible to install replacement windows which would not cause harm in the ways I have identified above whilst still achieving the appellant's aims.
11. For the reasons set out above, I consider that the proposal causes harm to the character and appearance of the host building and to the setting of the CA. The proposal, therefore, fails to comply with Policies DC1 and DC4 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Local Plan, February 2018 (LP). Amongst other things these policies seek to ensure that all development within the borough creates a high quality urban environment that respects and enhances its townscape context and heritage assets. The proposal would also conflict with Policy DC8 of the LP which states that applications should conserve the setting of, make a contribution to, or reveal the significance of the heritage asset.
12. Furthermore, the proposal would fail to conform with the Framework's expectation that new development within the setting of heritage assets should seek opportunities to enhance or better reveal their significance. The Framework also states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably. The proposal would fail to achieve these aims.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that permission should be granted. Therefore, taking all other matters raised into account, the appeal is dismissed.

L J O'Brien

INSPECTOR