
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 December 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/16/3158422
91 Wendell Road, London W12 9SB

- 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 Bryan Turner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/02030/FUL, dated 2 May 2016 was refused by notice dated 5 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension including formation of a hip to gable roof extension with retention of existing chimney stacks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (the Conservation Area). The Conservation Area is characterised by significant areas of recreational open space, a number of healthcare, religious and commercial buildings and extensive residential areas including 18th century semi-detached houses, Victorian terraces and Edwardian garden suburb style development.
 4. The appeal property is located on the south side of Wendell Road within a long row of garden suburb style houses which lies between the junctions of Hartswood Road and Rylett Crescent, overlooking Wendell Park. The houses in this section of the street are broken up into 3 shorter terraced groups which feature hipped roofs and tall chimney stacks. These hipped roofs create a space between the roof line of each terraced block, and the tall chimney stacks provide an effective visual end stop. Although some end properties, including the appeal property, have small dormers to the side, the form of the hipped roofs and chimney stacks has largely been retained. As such, the characteristic space separating the roof line of the terraces and the architectural punctuation created by the chimney stacks remains a consistent feature of development in this part of the street.
-

5. The proposed roof extension would alter the existing hipped roof to a gable, and would subsume much of both existing chimney stacks at roof level. It would therefore fail to respect the established form, symmetry and architectural rhythm of the host terrace, and would erode the characteristic spacing at roof level between the terraces. As a result, the development would appear discordant and out of place. It would be clearly visible in views from the street and from the public open space in Wendell Park.
6. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host terrace and the surrounding area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, the appeal proposal would be contrary to the design and heritage conservation and enhancement aims of Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy, Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan and SPD Design Policies 31 and 32 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document.
7. I conclude that the harm to the significance of the Conservation Area which I have identified above would be less than substantial. Paragraph 134 of the Framework states that, where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use. I do not consider that the provision of additional living accommodation within the appeal property would amount to a public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the heritage asset.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR