

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 November 2016

**by Mr J P Sargent BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 19 December 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/16/3159694**  
**16 St Dionis Road, London SW6 4TT**

- 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 Jenny Naylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
  - The application Ref 2016/03053/FUL, dated 4 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 September 2016.
  - The development proposed is raising the ridge of an existing terraced property to match the neighbour's.
- 

## Procedural matters

1. This appeal was linked to a second appeal at the property concerning a rear terrace (ref APP/H5390/D/16/3159746). However, that second appeal is the subject of a separate decision.

## Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. No 16 is a 19<sup>th</sup> Century artisan cottage. Although it sits within a long row of properties on the north side of St Dionis Road, this row was probably built in a number of phases. It appears likely that No 16 was constructed as part of a shorter block that includes 6-14 St Dionis Road (the terrace), and this is apparent because of the similarity in style and detail between those properties, and because of the way the terrace is terminated by the matching but handed hipped roofs on No 6 and No 16. Moreover, 18 St Dionis Road appears visually distinct from the terrace due to its greater height and the separation created by the strong intervening parapet wall.
  5. In 2015 planning permission was granted for, among other things, the hip at No 16 to be changed to a gable, and its ridge to be raised by 250mm to match that at No 14 next door (the 2015 permission). Those roof works do not yet appear to have begun. Permission is now sought once more to change the hip to a gable, but also to raise the ridge by a further 550mm to match that at No 18. This would be in addition to the 250mm increase already allowed, and
-

- so the ridge would be some 800mm higher than currently. The proposal would not change the roof angle, so would result in the ridgeline being further back.
6. Along the north side of the road there are a range of roof treatments due to the original designs and subsequent alterations. Indeed, even the terrace has slight variations in its roofscape as a result of the use of differing materials and the occasional presence of ridge tiles running up the slope to separate some of the houses, while rear roof extensions mean the alignment and height of the ridge in this terrace is not constant. Despite the effect of these variations though, when compared to the road beyond the terrace still has a certain unity resulting, in part, from its scale and its lower, relatively consistent ridge height. As a result, it is clear and distinct from No 18 and the properties to the west. I appreciate that because of the 2015 permission the termination of the terrace created by the hipped roofs at either end would be disrupted. However, the ridge height to No 16 accepted by that decision would be in general conformity with that found at No 6-14, and so the unity of the terrace would remain to a great extent.
  7. Given the extant 2015 permission I raise no objections to the loss of the hip. With regard to the raising of the ridge, this work would be concealed to some degree by the chimney when coming from the east and by the parapet of No 18 when travelling from the other direction. However, the increased ridge height and the more extensive roof plane would be apparent from in front of No 16. To my mind, these factors would give the roof a significantly greater bulk when compared to the rest of the terrace. Moreover, when taken with the greater set back of the ridge the scheme would not be informed by its context as it would relate poorly to the terrace's scale and proportions. Therefore, for these reasons it would be a discordant element in the streetscape.
  8. However, the rear of the terrace has already been severely disrupted by varied and sizeable additions over time, and so when seen from the back gardens the works would not cause harm.
  9. In coming to this view I am aware of the consultations concerning amending 'permitted development rights' for works to the upper storeys of buildings, but those have not yet been adopted and so I cannot afford them significant weight. In any event, an upward extension of No 16 has been accepted with the 2015 permission.
  10. It was also contended the scheme would relate to No 18 but, as stated above, that appears clearly separate to the terrace and so I see no justification for it informing the design of the appeal property in this way.
  11. Accordingly I conclude the development would detract unacceptably from the character and appearance of the area, and so would conflict with Policy BE1 in the *Core Strategy*, Policy DM G3 in the *Development Management Local Plan* and the *National Planning Policy Framework*.

## Conclusions

12. For the reasons stated the above appeal should be dismissed.

*J P Sargent*

INSPECTOR