



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2018

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 18 January 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/H5390/D/17/3180319

3 Delvino Road, London, SW6 4AE

- 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 R Pugsley against the decision of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/00955/FUL, dated 9 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 25 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. This is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the Parsons Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Parsons Green Conservation Area comprises largely Victorian development adjoining two major areas of public open space. The significance of the area lies partly in the contrast between the close knit two- and three-storey terraces and the open green spaces. I consider that it also includes the incorporation within the Area of a number of later developments which, though varying in appearance, reflect the form and scale of the streets where they occur.
4. The appeal site lies at one end of a terrace that was erected after the Second World War. Its two-storey height and bay windows reflect the older terrace opposite. It has a continuous roof with hip ends that is unbroken by party walls. There seem to have been only minor changes that affect the street scene – some velux windows, and painting the brickwork at the appeal site. In view of this, and its scale, form and design, I consider that this terrace continues to integrate rather more successfully into its older context than some of the other 20th century insertions I viewed.
5. The proposal would extend the ridge line much of the way towards the end of the roof. Although the angle of the front roof slope would be carried through, the hip end would be much steeper. The change in, and contrast of, roof slope would be clearly evident in the street scene. This outcome would significantly break the symmetry of the roof of the terrace. Both ends of the terrace would

not be readily appreciated from a single viewpoint, but I consider that the roof form of the building and the terrace is nonetheless an important design characteristic that is worthy of preservation. The negative effect would not be counteracted or outweighed by the retention of the gable parapet and two tall chimney stacks. The roof of the two-storey rear addition would receive a similar treatment. It is likely that this would be glimpsed from the road. However, the loss of balance with the roof form on the attached rear addition at no.5 would be obvious only from the secluded rear garden area.

6. I viewed much of the conservation area and saw some of the roof alterations referred to by the appellant, and others. Some of these received planning permission, for example mansard roofs on another 20th century terrace just around the corner. However, the circumstances here are different, in that, unlike in the appeal stretch of Delvino Road, there are mansard roofs on Victorian properties opposite. Moreover, there seems to be a pattern in the area in which roof alterations are concentrated in certain terraces, while in others the original roof forms are largely intact. No.s 3-13 Delvino Road and the Victorian terrace opposite fall firmly into the latter category.
7. The rear addition had been demolished at the time of my site visit, but I am told that some enlargement to its roof has already been approved. This change would not seem to affect the main roof or the hip end of the terrace.
8. I recognise that the impact that I have identified on the conservation area may be less than some of the other changes that can be seen. Nonetheless, I have found that harm would be caused to the significance of an important heritage asset. This harm would be "less than substantial", in the terms of paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework. As such, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal would make an additional floor of living accommodation available to the appellant. However, I would not regard this as a public benefit that would outweigh the great weight that the Framework says should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, in this case the Parsons Green Conservation Area.
9. I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the building and the terrace and would detract from the significance of the Parsons Green Conservation Area. It would thereby fall short of several development plan policies that seek to achieve high design standards for the scale, form and mass of development, and to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas. These include Policy BE1 in the Hammersmith and Fulham Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM G3 & DM G7 in the Development Management Local Plan (2013). In addition, the Council's *Planning Guidance* Supplementary Planning Document (2013) includes Design Policy guidance for development in conservation areas. Thus DP31 says that extensions and alterations should be appropriate to the architectural character of the building and not have a significant effect on the character of the area, while other guidance advises that roof extensions should be sympathetic to the character of the area.
10. On balance planning permission should be withheld, and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR