

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/16/3166896
361 Fulham Palace Road, London SW6 6TA

- 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 Property Quest Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/02101/FUL, dated 6 May 2016, was refused by a notice dated 31 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension, including raising hip to gable and erection of a third floor rear extension to part of the roof of the back addition to provide a studio flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property, 361 Fulham Palace Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 361 Fulham Palace Road is an attractive three-storey end of terrace which is situated in a prominent location on the corner of Edgarley Terrace. It lies within a designated Neighbourhood Parade and on a busy London Distributor Road. When travelling south along Fulham Palace Road there are clear views of the flank elevation and roof of this property.
 4. No 361 has been previously extended to the rear. However, the flat roof of the extension sits beneath the host property's eaves line and consequently its original simple hipped roof form remains intact. This roof form mirrors the roof of No 399 Fulham Palace Road, and together they provide the terrace with a distinct symmetry. The proposed hip to gable extension would upset the symmetry of the terrace, which currently makes a valuable contribution to the character of the area.
 5. The existing rear extension is subservient to the host property and the intrinsic design characteristics and form of this end of terrace property are clearly discernible. In contrast, the scale and mass of the proposed third floor addition, together with the rear mansard roof extension, would dominate the host property and significantly alters its original form. In particular, the third floor addition would mask the property's original eaves line and distort its
-

original simple lines and proportions. The flank and rear elevations are particularly conspicuous from Edgarley Terrace, and consequently the contribution this vernacular property currently makes to the character and appearance would be lost.

6. I have had regard to the neighbouring mansard roof extension; however this addition is not visually conspicuous from the street and is not therefore directly comparable. I have also taken into consideration the proposed extension which has been permitted at 359 Fulham Palace Road, and which is located on the opposite corner of Edgarley Terrace. However in this instance, although the roof extension would be substantial and alter the form of the property's flat roof, the property's original eaves line would not be breached. Furthermore, the rear addition would remain clearly distinct and subservient to the host property. This proposed extension is not therefore directly comparable to this appeal case, and in any event it would not justify the harm I have identified above.
7. I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, 361 Fulham Place Road and the surrounding area. It would conflict with the development plan, and in particular with Policy BE1 of Hammersmith & Fulham's Core Strategy, 2011 and Policy DM G3 of Hammersmith & Fulham's Development Management Local Plan, 2013 which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development respects local context and character, and extensions should be compatible with the scale and character of existing development and successfully integrate into the architectural design of the existing building.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INPSECTOR