
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 26 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/16/3160344

11 Salisbury Pavement, Dawes Road, London SW6 7HT

- 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 Wayne Leal against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/02453/FUL, dated 23 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof top extension to 11 Salisbury Pavement to create 1 studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the above description of the proposal from the planning application form. The Council altered the description on the decision notice to include reference to the proposed extension at third floor level on top of the existing back addition.

Main Issues

3. The first main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Central Fulham Conservation Area (CA). The second is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers at No 10 with respect to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located within a terrace of traditional Victorian properties within the stretch of Dawes Road known as Salisbury Pavement. This terrace and those on the opposite side of the road tightly enclose the street which is typical of the tight knit pattern of development generally in the CA. The rear elevations of the terrace can also be seen from Estcourt Road across the grounds of St Thomas's School. The rear elevations of the buildings in the terrace are less uniform with rear outrigger additions being commonplace. The boundary of the CA runs along Estcourt Road.
 5. The proposal would involve extending above the existing top floor flat. This would involve the creation of a pitched roof at the front, set behind the existing
-

- parapet. At the back, a steeper pitched roof would be constructed over the roof of the rear outrigger and a newly created parapet.
6. The buildings within the terrace towards the junction of Dawes Road and Estcourt Road include pitched roofs. These can be seen from the rear and from the front. The buildings at No 12 and 13 to the west have largely undeveloped flat roofs similar to the appeal building as do those within the terrace to the east. There is a gap at roof level between the appeal site and the higher buildings close to the junction with Estcourt Road.
 7. The appellant draws attention to the planning permission for a roof top extension at No 13. I do not have all of those details. However from the information that has been provided, those alterations would appear as a contiguous extension of the existing roofline of properties near the junction. That development is in a very different context and even if that development were constructed, there would still be a gap between it and the appeal site.
 8. At the rear, the roof additions would be very noticeable from Estcourt Road across the enclosures around the school grounds. The roof top extension would be very conspicuous and in contrast to the adjoining flat roofs along the terrace when seen from this direction. It would stand out alongside adjoining flat roofs rather than appearing as an extension of existing development at that level. With the proposed roof sloping away behind the parapet, the lower parts of the front roof would be difficult to see from street level in Dawes Road. The higher parts of the extended roof and the raised party walls would be more visible. The development may also be more noticeable from the first floor windows of the dwellings on the opposite side of Dawes Road.
 9. The proposal would be a substantial addition high up on the building. The roof extension would look incongruous along this terrace. It would not be subservient to the existing building or the adjoining terrace.
 10. In relation to the first main issue, the proposed extension would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would not comply with Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the Development Management Local Plan 2013¹ (LP) and BE1 of the Core Strategy 2011². This would not be sympathetic to the character of the CA as required by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)³ Policy 32.

Living conditions

11. The extension above the outrigger would extend out a considerable depth at the back of the terrace. There would be an additional degree of enclosure, at a high level of the space at the back of the buildings due to the increased height of the building at the appeal site.
12. There are windows in the rear elevation of No 10. The Council's concerns relate to those within the angled outrigger which face towards the appeal site. I did not visit No 10 but I could see through the windows of the first and second floors and could see a staircase. The supporting statement that was submitted with the planning application refers to these windows serving a stairwell. The SPD at Policy 7 seeks to safeguard windows serving rooms from

¹ London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Development Management Local, adopted July 2013

² London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Core Strategy, adopted October 2011

³ London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham, Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document, July 2013

obstruction due to new development. From the information provided it appears that these windows do not serve rooms and therefore the impact upon outlook from them would not have a significant impact upon the enjoyment of those properties.

13. In relation to the second main issue, proposal would not have a harmful impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers at No 10 with respect to outlook. This would not conflict with LP Policies DM A9 and DM G3.

Other Matters

14. I have been provided with limited information about the housing needs and supply within the area. However, I do give some weight to the benefits of providing an additional dwelling within an accessible urban area which would use space efficiently.
15. I have explained why the approved extension at No 13 is not in the same context as the proposal. In addition, I have no information to indicate whether that scheme is likely to take place or not and it has little weight in my consideration of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. The harm to the significance of the CA would not be substantial. However my conclusion in relation to the second main issue and my consideration of the above other matters do not provide public benefits sufficient to outweigh my conclusion in relation to the first main issue. This would not comply with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
17. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR