
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Alexander Walker MPlan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 25th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3174100
91 Wendell Road, London W12 9SB

- 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 Bryan Turner against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2016/05283/FUL, dated 5 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear roof extension dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling 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 located within the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area (the CA). The CA is characterised by significant areas of public open space, most notably Ravenscourt Park. There is a mix of uses throughout the CA, which include healthcare, religious and commercial buildings. However, it is predominantly composed of residential properties that vary in their scale and design, including 18th century semi-detached houses, Victorian terraces and Edwardian garden suburb style development.
4. The appeal property is a two-storey, end-terrace with accommodation in the loft space. The gap between the side elevation of the property and the adjacent terrace row that terminates on the junction of Wendell Road and Hartswood Road is very narrow. However, the hipped roofs enhance the spacing between the properties and, along with the tall chimney stacks on the end elevations, demarcate the end of the terrace rows. I note that views of this spacing from the road are limited. Nevertheless, it plays an important role in defining the end of the terrace.
5. There is an existing small dormer extension on the side of the roof. The Council confirm that there is no planning history for this although it has clearly been in place for some years. With the exception of this small dormer extension, when viewed from the road, the property mirrors the adjacent

- property, No 93 Wendell Road. This symmetry is a common theme amongst other properties within the terraces.
6. There is also a larger dormer extension on the rear of the roof. Both of the existing dormer extensions serve a single room in the roof space. Their modest size and positioning ensures that the visual break between the two chimneys is retained and the hipped roof design is not disrupted. Although the existing small dormer does reduce the spacing between the properties and diminishes their symmetry.
 7. The proposed extension would wrap around the side and rear planes of the hipped roof. As a result of it extending significantly beyond the hip formed by the junction of the side and rear roof planes the extension would dominate the rear elevation of the property, failing to appear as a subservient addition.
 8. I note that other properties in the terrace have rear dormers, which accommodate the full width of the roof. However, these properties do not have hipped roofs or have the same end-terrace role as the appeal property. Therefore, I cannot draw any direct comparison with the appeal proposal.
 9. Furthermore, whilst it would remain stepped back from the chimney stacks, it would nevertheless provide a backdrop to them and therefore diminish the visual space between them when viewed from Wendell Road. This would also enhance the bulkiness of the extension as it would be read in conjunction with the chimney stacks.
 10. The proposal would not be readily visible from public views. However, the character and appearance of the CA is appreciated from both public and private views. The dormer extension would be clearly visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties.
 11. Overall, it would appear as an incongruous bulky addition that would fail to reflect the hipped roof design of the dwelling and the important role it has in defining the end of the terrace. Consequently, it would have a significantly harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the CA.
 12. I have had regard to the dormer extension at No 77 Wendell Road. Whilst it is similar to that proposed, I do not consider that it makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area. Furthermore, the end property on the adjacent terrace has also had roof extensions. The role the original hipped roofs played in defining the terraces has already been harmed and as a result the distinction between the terrace rows is less legible. However, I do not consider that this harm should be furthermore enhanced.
 13. Paragraph 134 of the Framework confirms that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use. Whilst the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, I find no substantive public benefits that would outweigh this harm.

14. I find therefore that the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Ravenscourt and Starch Green Conservation Area, contrary to Policy BE1 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council Core Strategy 2011, which, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development is of the highest standard of design and protects and enhances the character, appearance and setting of the borough's Conservation Areas. In addition, it would also fail to comply with Policies DM G3 and DM G7 of the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council Development Management Local Plan 2013, which similarly seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design and protects the borough's Conservation Areas. Also, it would fail to accord with the advice contained within the London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2013, which states that rear roof extensions should be sympathetic to the character of the Conservation Area and the loss of hipped roofs will be resisted.

Other Matters

15. During my site visit I took the opportunity to view the various roof extensions in the locality that have been the subject of planning permission, as referred to me by the appellant. Nos 64 and 66 Hartswood Road are a pair of semi-detached dwellings with generous spacing with neighbouring properties. As the approved scheme¹ was for similar roof extensions to both properties, it retained the symmetry between them. Furthermore, whilst it resulted in the loss of space between the chimney stacks, these would not have had the same defining role in demarcating the end of the terrace as those on the appeal property. Therefore, I note that in principle, the scheme suggests that the Council are not opposed to extensions to hipped roofs and the reduction in space between chimney stacks. However, there is no direct comparison with the circumstances of the appeal property to suggest that the Council have inconsistently determined the two schemes.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, having regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Alexander Walker

INSPECTOR

¹ LPA Ref 2015/0359/FUL