
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2017

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/16/3162613
16 Ceylon Road, London W14 0PY

- 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 Peter Kennedy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/03673/FUL, dated 11 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 7 October 2016.
 - The development proposed was described as *'this application is following a prior application to change the building line of the front elevation of my roof and introduce new windows'*.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to 16 Ceylon Road, a two storey terraced dwelling situated within the Lakeside/Sinclair/Blythe Road Conservation Area. I saw at my site visit that the Conservation Area has a predominantly residential character, derived from its terrace housing, though there are areas of later housing block development of different architectural styles evident such as Elgar Court near the appeal site.
 4. Whilst the host terrace displays some uniformity in broad design, fenestration pattern and materials used, there is some variation in the appearance of dwellings in terms of their roofs. I saw at my site visit that some buildings have pitched roofs with visible eaves whilst others have parapets. I also observed the variety in roof extensions. No 16 is one of a small group of buildings with pitched roofs with no front parapets, situated between groups of buildings with parapets. It is proposed that a front roof extension, a front parapet and parapet party wall are added to the appeal property to match those of the adjoining 15 Ceylon Road.
 5. The proposed roof extension and addition of the parapet walls would give rise to a significant change in the appearance of the dwelling within the street scene. Although of a similar a design to the neighbouring No 15, the proposed
-

extension is not of the more usual tile hung mansard roof design seen elsewhere on the street. The proposed development would not respect the simple roof lines of the host dwelling and would introduce unwelcome changes to the roof and eaves line. In addition, the provision of a glass balustrade and small balcony would be seen as discordant features. Consequently, the appeal scheme would erode the historic character of the property and would not be a positive contribution to the street scene. It would be seen as an over dominant and incongruous addition to the property and would give rise to harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I do not consider that the roof extension at No 15 provides an example which should inevitably be followed given the harm found.

6. Having found harm to the Conservation Area, I give it considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that in determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. This is in line with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 in respect of development affecting conservation areas, which states that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area. Paragraph 132 of the Framework sets out that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the conservation of the asset.
7. Paragraph 126 of the Framework recognises that historic assets are an irreplaceable resource that local authorities should conserve in a manner appropriate to their significance. The harm found in this case would be less than substantial to the extensive Conservation Area as a whole and paragraph 134 of the Framework sets out that any harm, which is less than substantial, must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal. Whilst the harm to an individual site may be less than substantial, the incremental and cumulative harm that could arise from similar proposals could adversely affect the Conservation Area and the heritage asset as a whole. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm requires clear and convincing justification. In this case the appeal proposal relates to a private dwelling and no public benefits have been identified to weigh against the harm found.
8. The appeal proposal conflicts with Core Strategy¹ Policy BE1 which is concerned with the built environment and design and includes that development respects local context and character. It also conflicts with DMLP² Policies DM G3 and DM G7 which amongst other things are concerned alterations and extensions and heritage and conservation, including the protection and enhancement of conservation areas. The appeal proposal also fails to accord with SPD³ Design Policies 31 and 32 which amongst other things are concerned with alterations to buildings including roof extensions and materials and expect development to be appropriate to the architectural character of the building and not have a significant effect on the character of the conservation area.

¹ Hammersmith and Fulham Council Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2011 (Core Strategy)

² Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan 2013 (DMLP)

³ Hammersmith and Fulham Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD)

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR