
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 October 2017

by Rachael A Bust BSc (Hons) MA MSc LLM MEnvSci MInstLM MCMI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3179521
189 Seagrave Road, London SW6 1ST

- 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 Mrs Lorna Cobbold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham.
 - The application Ref 2017/01093/FUL, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and minor alterations to existing windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Lorna Cobbold against Council of the London Borough of Hammersmith & Fulham. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 189 Seagrave Road is a 2-storey terraced dwelling within a row of 8. The appeal proposal is seeking a rear roof extension to enable a loft conversion. In addition 3 rooflights are proposed on the front.
5. From the public realm of Seagrave Road there is a clear view of the rear elevations of all 8 properties. The context to the character and appearance of the host property is defined by its position within the terrace. Given the layout of the surrounding area the terrace of properties from No 187 to 201 Seagrave Road forms a distinct visual group of its own. Consequently when assessing the impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area this is restricted to this individual terrace.
6. Of the 8 properties in the terrace, 4 have had some form of rear roof alteration. These roof alterations involve 3 different styles. No 201 located at the eastern end of the terrace has had a modest roof alteration involving the installation of a dormer style roof extension. Nos 195 and 191 within the centre of the terrace have both had mansard style roof alterations, which are

- broadly similar in appearance. No 187 has had a roof extension which involved the height of the rear elevation wall being raised.
7. Whilst there is no uniform style of roof alterations on the terrace, the extensions on Nos 191, 195 and 201, all retain the original characteristic division between the rear elevation wall and the roof structure.
 8. The appeal proposal at No 189 would sit between the 2 contrasting styles of roof alterations undertaken on the neighbouring properties. The appellant has taken their design lead from No 187. However, I find that this would accentuate the harm to the character and appearance of the terrace through the further loss of the clear distinction between the rear elevation wall and the roof structure. The original clear division between these two design features remains on 7 out of the 8 dwellings within the terrace. As such I consider that the roof extension permitted at No 187 is an anomaly.
 9. In addition the proposed design incorporates a full width window located directly above the proposed addition to the rear elevation wall. As such this would lead to the loss of any visual sense of roofscape when viewed from the rear and the public realm.
 10. I note that the appellant has presented architectural character study of a selection of designs of other dwellings throughout Hammersmith and Fulham low rise housing estates. However, in this case the main issue to the determination of this appeal is the impact on the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace within which it sits.
 11. It is acknowledged that Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) does indicate that decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles. However, it does suggest that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness. In this case, I find that the existing distinctive characteristics of the host property would be lost.
 12. I conclude that the proposed roof extension would represent an incongruous addition to the host property which would represent a discordant feature within the terrace. Accordingly the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently the appeal proposal conflicts with Policy BE1 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy, which seeks, amongst other things, development which respects local context and character. There would also be conflict with Policy DM G3 of the Hammersmith and Fulham Development Management Local Plan, which seeks amongst other things, that alterations and extensions be compatible with the character of existing development and to successfully integrate into the architectural design of the existing building.
 13. The proposed installation of the 3 rooflights in the front elevation is considered by the Council to be a modest alteration. There are rooflights present within other dwellings within the terrace. I see no reason to disagree with the Council.

Other matters

14. The Council in its reason for refusal refers to conflict with SPD Housing Policies 7 and 8 of the Planning Guidance Supplementary Planning Document. However, I note that from the Officer Report that it was concluded that the proposal complies with these 2 policies. Consequently, there is no substantive

evidence before me to indicate that the proposal fails to comply with these policies.

15. The appellant refers to SPD Design Policy 32. However, as this relates only to proposals within Conservation Areas, as such it is not relevant to the determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, and taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. This outweighs my findings in relation to the 3 proposed rooflights on the front elevation. Consequently, on balance the overall scheme would be unacceptable and the appeal is dismissed.

Rachael A Bust

INSPECTOR