
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 June 2017

by Andy Harwood CMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/W/17/3172706

Flat 6 Hazlitt House, Milson Road, London W14 0LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Geoffrey Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/05282/FUL, dated 5 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer to rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the name for the appellant as clarified since the submission of this appeal.

Main Issues

3. Whether the proposed dormer would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Lakeside, Sinclair and Blythe Road Conservation Area (CA). The second is the effect of the proposal upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with respect to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located on the northern side of Milson Road on the corner where the road joins Hazlitt Road. The 5 storey detached building includes a floor level within the roof space enabled by a prominent front dormer which dominates that roof slope. The existing dormer pre-dates the CA designation, according to the Council.
5. The building is separated from the traditional terrace along Milson Road by a gap and a modern dwelling at the end of that terrace. The building is of an attractive traditional form with, aside from the larger front dormer, a hipped roof. The building includes design details such as the use of brick, plaster bands and traditional window proportions, similar to nearby buildings, particularly the end of terrace building on the opposite corner of the road. The CA does have some variation in the appearance of buildings and this includes a number of styles of dormers in prominent positions. However the existing

dormers do not reflect the traditional original form of the host buildings and are not positive features within the CA.

6. The proposal would add a dormer on the rear roof slope. This would not be as deep as the existing front dormer and would terminate at a point in line with one of the chimney stacks. Whilst the structure would not be as prominent as the front dormer or others nearby, it would be clearly visible from Hazlit Road and also from properties that back onto the site. This would look cumbersome on the roof and would dominate the rear roof slope rather than being subservient to the existing building. Although it would be a more modern form than other dormers in the area, it would not be an innovative design. The proposal would not protect, restore or enhance the quality, character or appearance of the building or the wider CA.
7. In relation to the first main issue the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. This would not comply with Policies DM G7 and DM G3 of the Development Management Local Plan¹ (DMLP) or Policy BE1 of the Core Strategy² (CS). The alterations would not be appropriate to the architectural character of the building or sympathetic to the CA and therefore would not comply with Policies 31 and 32 of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)³. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. This would create a much more comfortable space for the occupiers. However, this would not be a public benefit of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm, not complying therefore with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the framework).

Living conditions

8. The building is approximately parallel to the terrace of properties in Sinclair Road, the rear elevations of which include many windows facing the site. The rear elevation of Hazlit House has window reveals but those that I could see have been blocked up. In contrast, the large window within the rear elevation of the proposed dormer would face directly towards the windows within the rear elevations of those nearby dwellings in Sinclair Road. The distance between windows would be far below the 18m recommended in the Council's SPD. There is already some inter-visibility between rows of buildings but this would result in a further loss of privacy for neighbours within adjoining properties.
9. In relation to the second main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties due to a loss of privacy. This would not comply with DMLP Policies DM A9 or DM G3.

Conclusion

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

Andy Harwood

INSPECTOR

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

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

³ Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document – July 2013