

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2017

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3167144

20a Paddenswick Road, London W6 0UB

- 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 McWeeney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2015/05737/FUL, dated 4 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the formation of a mansard roof extension with front dormer window, the demolition of a single storey side extension in order to create a courtyard and other related alterations to the dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for the formation of a mansard roof extension with front dormer window, the demolition of a single storey side extension in order to create a courtyard and other related alterations at 20a Paddenswick Road, London W6 0UB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2015/05737/FUL, dated 4 December 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the street scene and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2 storey former office building for which prior approval has been gained for its conversion to a dwelling. It abuts the side and rear boundaries of the site, faces a courtyard area and is set back from Paddenswick Road making it an insignificant element in the street scene. The property is within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area which, in the vicinity of the appeal site, primarily comprises 3-storey blocks of flats and tall terraced housing.
 4. The proposal would primarily comprise the replacement of the shallow pitched hipped roof with a mansard to enable the formation of a bedroom with en-suite facilities. Whilst this would increase the height and bulk of the property, by virtue of its relatively modest footprint, set back location and the screening
-

afforded by nearby trees, it would remain subordinate in scale to the neighbouring buildings and an insignificant element in views from Paddenswick Road.

5. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the street scene and would preserve the character of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area. It therefore complies with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy Local Development Framework (2011) and Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan (2013) which, amongst other matters, seek development that respects local context and protects the character and appearance of the borough's conservation areas.

Other Matters

6. I am satisfied that the proposal would not result in a significant reduction in natural light reaching, or outlook from, neighbouring properties and unacceptable overlooking would not result from the additional windows proposed. I note that the use of the flat roof for amenity purposes would have unacceptable effects on the occupiers of neighbouring properties and have therefore imposed a planning condition prohibiting this.

Conditions

7. Having regard to paragraph 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is imposed.
8. In order to adequately protect the appearance of the property and its surroundings I consider it necessary to require new materials to match the existing and external elements to be restricted. In respect of the roof addition, which includes a prominent dormer in the front elevations I consider it necessary for the materials to be approved by the Council.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

S Poole

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 301, 302, 303, 305 (Proposed Second Floor Plan), 305 (Proposed Section AA), 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311.

- 3) Materials to be used in respect of the alterations of the basement, ground and first floors of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the mansard extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
- 5) No plumbing, extract flues or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed on the front elevation of the building. No water tanks, water tank enclosures or other structures shall be erected upon the flat roofs of the extensions hereby permitted.
- 6) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.